National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

BY

GARY BABIUK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1987

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-41156-2

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: GARY EUGENE BABIUK

TITLE OF THESIS: THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

DEGREE: MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1987

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

G G Babiuk
.....
(Student's signature)

General Delivery
.....
(Student's permanent address)
Vermilion, Alberta T0B 4M0
.....

Date: October 9, ... 1987

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE TEACHER EVALUATION PROGRAM

submitted by GARY EUGENE BABIUK

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION.

.....
(Supervisor)

.....

.....

Date: Oct 9/87

I dedicate this document to my parents

Vivian and Eugene.

ABSTRACT

In 1985 Alberta Education mandated that all school jurisdictions in Alberta establish a program of yearly evaluation of teachers. This has resulted in the review of existing procedures by school boards. With this in mind, this study was conducted to try to determine the characteristics of an effective program for teacher evaluation.

A review of the literature, both Canadian and American, lead to the use the results of a major project conducted by the RAND Corporation as a model of comparison and representative of research in general. From the RAND study five distinct characteristics emerged as necessary for an effective teacher evaluation program. They were consistency of evaluation, commitment from central administration, competency of evaluators, collaboration between administration and teachers, and compatibility with other programs in the school system.

A two phase study was developed to examine the validity of these characteristics in an Alberta setting. The first phase was to survey the 116 superintendents of Alberta in order to summarize their views on the characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program.

The second phase was to conduct a case study of the school jurisdiction that received the most nominations from the surveys of Alberta superintendents. Interviews were

utilized to obtain the bulk of the data. The findings of both phases were content analysed and generated two unique groups of characteristics for an effective teacher evaluation program.

The results of both phases of this study concurred with the RAND study characteristics of consistency, commitment, compatibility, and competency. The need for collaboration and cooperation of teachers was considered important by Alberta superintendents, however in the case study collaboration was not seen as important as strong leadership and direction from administrators.

Both groups saw two other characteristics as imperative for the implementation of an effective teacher evaluation program. First, their is a need for feedback and follow-up after evaluations have occurred. The second unique characteristic was the need for an atmosphere of trust. This trust must be developed through a collegial, positive approach to the teacher evaluation program. The main goal must be the improvement of instruction for the benefit of students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my advisor and mentor, Dr. Joe Fris, for his support and encouragement which enabled me to complete the Masters program. In particular, his editorial expertise and advise were instrumental in the completion of this document.

I would like to thank Dr. Larry Beauchamp and Dr. Al Mackay for providing valuable input and sitting on my advisory committee.

I wish to thank Ken Jesse for allowing me to visit the Red Deer Public School District and the other educators that I interviewed in Red Deer for their time and essential dialogue. I learned a great deal more about education then just teacher evaluation.

I also acknowledge the support, friendship and shared ideas provided by my fellow students on the Ed. Admin floor during my year at the University of Alberta, 1985/86.

I thank the following friends; Tom Brown for his advise and proof reading, Maureen Matson for typing the interview transcripts, Brenda for her assistance in proofreading all of my essays and papers and finally Don Chapman for his scholarly advise and constant encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank my children; Karen, Stephen, Jennifer and Sandra for their love and patience while I was working on my degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Tables	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction and Purpose	1
Purpose	2
Research Questions	3
Significance	4
Limitations	6
Delimitations	7
Thesis Organization	8
2. Review of the Literature	12
Introduction	12
Status of Teacher Evaluation	13
Recent Historical Developments in Alberta	14
Conceptual Framework	17
Definitions	17
Concepts	19
American Scene	26
Canadian Scene	35
Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program	41
Conclusion	43

3. Methodology 45
Introduction 45
Design Considerations 45
Phase 1 - Questionnaire and Case Selection . 48
Objectives 48
Sampling 50
Questionnaire Development 51
Questionnaire Format 52
The Letter of Transmittal 52
Follow-up Letter 54
Phase 2 - Case Study 55
Gaining Assess 55
Preliminary Preparations/Pilot study . . . 56
Fieldwork 57
Arrival 57
Sampling 60
Interviews 61
Document collection 64
Findings and Data Analysis 65
Phase 1 - Questionnaire 65
Phase 2 - Case Study 66
Rigor 70
Generalizability 73
Ethical Considerations 74
4. Findings 77
Phase 1 - Questionnaire 77
Question One 78

Consistent responses 78
Diverse responses 84
Significance 90
Question Two 94
Question Three 95
Question Four 96
Part Five 97
Phase 2 - Case Study 98
Context 98
External 98
Internal 100
Historical Background/Context 104
Development and Implementation of the Current Policy 107
Rationale 108
Role of stakeholders 110
In-service 113
Problems/solutions 114
Teacher Evaluation Policies 116
Teacher Evaluation/Present Situation . . . 119
Tenure and permanent certification . . . 120
School review 123
Regular in-school evaluation 125
Teachers in difficulties 127
Evaluation of administrators 129
Strengths and Weaknesses 131
Strengths 131

Weaknesses 138
5. Analysis of Findings 143
Introduction 143
Characteristics of an Effective
Teacher Evaluation Program 143
Review of the Literature 144
Survey of the Superintendents - Phase 1 . 144
Case Study - Phase 2 145
Synthesis 147
Correspondence Between Policy and Practice. . 151
Goals of Education 151
Role Descriptions 152
Superintendent of schools. 152
Assistant Superintendent 153
Deputy Superintendent 153
Coordinators 154
Principals 155
Supervision and Evaluation 155
School Review and Evaluation 157
Program Review and Evaluation 158
System Review and Evaluation 159
Summary and Conclusions 160
Factors Affecting Implementation 160
1. Need and relevance of the change . . 161
2. Clarity 162
3. Complexity 162
4. Quality and practicality of program . 163

5. The history of innovation attempts . 164
6. The adoption process 164
7. Central administrative support and involvement 165
8. Staff development and participation . 166
9. Time-line and information system . . 167
10. Board and community characteristics . 167
11. The principal 168
12. Teacher-teacher relationship 168
13. Teacher characteristics and orientations 169
14. Role of government 169
15. External assistance 170
Conclusions 170
6. Summary, Implications and Recommendations . . 172
Summary 172
Purpose/Problem 172
Findings - Phase 1 173
Findings - Phase 2 174
Conclusions 179
Implications 181
Theory 181
Research 182
Recommendations 182
REFERENCES 186
APPENDIX 1. PROVINCIAL EVALUATION POLICIES 195
APPENDIX 2. LETTER FROM DEPUTY MINISTER 197

APPENDIX 3. SUPERINTENDENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE 202

APPENDIX 4. COVERING LETTER / SURVEY 204

APPENDIX 5. FOLLOW-UP LETTER 206

APPENDIX 6. CASE STUDY - PRELIMINARY PLAN 208

APPENDIX 7. INTERVIEW GUIDE 212

APPENDIX 8. COVERING LETTER / PERCEPTION CHECK . . 217

APPENDIX 9. COMMENTS / KNOWLEDGE 219

APPENDIX 10. COMMENTS / FEEDBACK 221

APPENDIX 11. COMMENTS / SUPPORT 223

APPENDIX 12. COMMENTS / COOPERATION 225

APPENDIX 13. COMMENTS / RESEARCH 227

APPENDIX 14. COMMENTS / TRUST 229

APPENDIX 15. NOMINATION TOTALS 232

APPENDIX 16. RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT #104

POLICIES 234

GOALS OF THE R.D.P.S.C. #104 (1000) . . . 235

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS (3005) 236

SCHOOL REVIEWS AND EVALUATION (3007) . . 237

SYSTEM REVIEWS AND EVALUATION (3008) . . 240

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT (3009) 243

DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT (3010) 245

COORDINATOR (7010) 247

PRINCIPAL (7020) 249

SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION (7041) 253

PROGRAM REVIEW AND EVALUATION 257

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
2	Comparison of RAND Study to other Literature	44
4.1	Number of Responses for the Consistent Category	79
4.2	Number of Responses for the Diverse Category	85
4.3	Hallmarks of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program	91
4.4	Red Deer Public School System	100
4.5	Distribution of Personnel Interviewed	102
4.6	Rank Order of Strength Responses by Stakeholder Group	133
4.7	Rank Order of Weakness Responses by Stakeholder Group	139
5.1	Summary of Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program	147
5.2	Combined List of Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program	148

CHAPTER 1

Introduction and Purpose

The last few years have been turbulent times for teachers in Alberta. In particular, there have been some political events that have had deep rooted effects on teachers in classrooms and on their supervisors, many of them concerned with the effectiveness of instructors and instruction. This concern for the competence of teachers was outlined in the preamble of the Ghitter Report on Tolerance and Understanding. One of the important concerns was:

> What processes should be adopted in order that teachers lacking in competence and/or failing in performance are appropriately identified, assisted, counselled, disciplined, and if necessary dismissed in a fair but expeditious manner.(Ghitter,1984:18)

Regardless of whether or not these concerns resulted from the aftermath of the unfortunate incidents in Eckville (the Keegstra Affair) or the government's move toward more efficiency and accountability in education, the concern over teacher quality and competency has increased. This, in turn, has led to the perceived need to evaluate teachers better. As a consequence, the Department of Education has taken two distinct actions. The first was to mandate a minimal level of teacher evaluation (along with similar plans dealing with student, school, district, and program

evaluations) which is outlined in the Management Finance Plan (see Appendix 1). The second action taken was revealed on March 29, 1985 by Mr. King, then Minister of Education. He stated:

> The establishment of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards (COATS) will ensure that Alberta's teachers maintain high standards in the classroom. Teachers, the community, and the government are interested in the constant improvement of these standards, through this Council I will be looking at teacher competency and professional activities related to improving teaching in Alberta. (News Release #8, 1985)

Purpose

Although the Department of Education has taken action in relationship to teacher evaluation, as indicated by the evaluation portion of the MFP and the formation of COATS, the responsibility for implementation of teacher evaluation policies still remains at the local level. Each local board must design teacher evaluation policies that meet the minimal requirements of the MFP and the needs of the school jurisdiction. "The primary responsibility for the evaluation of individual teacher performance and the quality of teaching practices lies with each school board." (Program Policy Manual,1985:50). Thus the superintendent, the chief administrative officer of the board, is responsible for developing a program to meet these provincially mandated policies and any other goals the local school jurisdiction feels are necessary.

However, the development of a teacher supervision

program is not an easy task. In organizations as complex as schools there are many variables that affect this process and the manner in which it is finally implemented. These factors lead to the purpose of the study which is to try to determine the characteristics that are important in developing and implementing an effective teacher evaluation program. By researching an effective teacher evaluation program already in existence using a modified case study approach and then comparing the results to the literature and the data collected from a survey of Alberta superintendents it is hoped that a list of major characteristics will emerge.

Research Questions

In order to guide the research, the following research questions have been developed. The primary question is "What are the characteristics of an effective program for teacher evaluation?". A number of sub- questions also are addressed in the case study. They are as follows:

Antecedents

1. What was the impetus that led to the development of the teacher evaluation program?
2. What were the effects of the local environment on the development of the teacher evaluation program?

Developmental

3. What were the steps or processes used to develop the

teacher evaluation program?

4. What were the underlying goals and purposes of the teacher evaluation program?

Current Situation

5. What is the current status of the teacher evaluation program?

6. How is the teacher evaluation program integrated with other programs and policies of the school jurisdiction?

7. How do the major stakeholders (teachers, administrators) view the development and implementation of the teacher evaluation program?

8. What are the strengths of the teacher evaluation program?

Future

9. What are the weaknesses in the program or what adaptations must be made to insure continued success of the teacher evaluation program?

10. What is the future of the teacher evaluation program?

Significance

Teacher evaluation has always been an area of discussion in education circles. In all countries of the world, teacher evaluation has occurred in one form or another. In the more developed countries such as the United

States, Great Britain, Australia and Canada (unlike most developing countries which have a shortage of teachers), teacher evaluation has been seen as more critical. This maybe the result of the public outcry for accountability. In particular this sentiment has developed in the United States which so dramatically influences the Canadian education scene.

Historically teacher evaluation was conducted by travelling superintendents who dropped in on teachers without warning. In the early 1970s, with amendments to the Alberta School Act, a period of uncertainty with regard to teacher evaluation occurred. Sensing a problem, there had been a move by government for a number of years in Alberta, possibly for reasons of accountability, to evaluate teachers and monitor their competence. Then, with the disastrous developments of the "Keegstra Affair" and the resulting public pressure on the Minister of Education, a number of programs to regulate teacher supervision were implemented by the Department of Education. The establishment of COATS, the evaluation section of the MFP, and the striking of the Ghitter Committee to investigate tolerance and understanding are examples of this swift action. As a result, school jurisdictions are devoting more resources (fiscal, time, human) to planning, implementing, evaluating, and refining their teacher supervision policies and programs to meet these mandated guidelines.

All over North America, educators are being confronted

with the dilemma of teacher evaluation. Many authors have written papers and a multitude of researchers has tried to clarify and identify the most effective means of ensuring that the quality of teaching is improved. But difficulties have emerged and many unanswered questions remain, such as: what is effective teaching, what are the goals of education, how should teachers be evaluated, who should carry this out, and many more. As stated by Scriven(1981:244)

> Teacher evaluation is a disaster. The practices are shoddy and the principles are unclear. Recent work has suggested some ways to clarify the issue and to make the procedures more equitable and reasonably valid but one cannot yet point to a single exemplary system in which the practices come near to matching our knowledge.

By reviewing the literature and conducting a case study of a school jurisdiction that already has established an effective teacher supervision program, my study may provide practical guidelines and a model to assist other educators in rebuilding the confidence of teachers, administrators, government, and parents.

Limitations

The use of a case study and interviews has inherent limitations. First, the results of the case study are limited by the ability of the researcher to gain rapport with the respondents. This rapport can affect the quality and quantity of the information reported. I endeavored to overcome these with prior practice in interview techniques,

by pilot testing the interview questions on the principal and staff of the school in which he formerly worked, and by communicating enthusiasm toward the project.

Second, my biases and those of the personnel being interviewed are another limitation. A closely related problem is the limited ability of the respondents to recall past information (selective memory). By interviewing a number of different respondents chosen randomly, and comparing the results of the interviews with documentation (a form of triangulation), I feel that a reasonably accurate picture of the teacher supervision program emerged. As for researcher's biases, this has been constantly considered; and by reporting the results of the interviews as clearly as possible and having the participants review the data for accuracy, bias has been kept to a minimum.

The case study method of gathering research information also limits the generalizability of the results. However, because the teacher evaluation mandate is province-wide and comparisons have been made to research, the theoretical literature, and other reports from Alberta, the significance and relevance of the findings for other school jurisdictions in Alberta should be considerable.

Delimitations

The major delimitation in this study is that the investigation had to be reduced to a single case study

because of the limited time available to carry out interviews with numerous personnel in the school jurisdiction and to analyze the results. To provide some further comparisons, a preliminary questionnaire survey of 116 superintendents in Alberta was conducted, with the intention of providing an offsetting global perspective to compare to the individual case study.

The second delimitation was the decision to partially replicate a study carried out in the United States for the Rand Corporation (Wise et al,1985). After reviewing this report which was very extensive not only in the authors' review of the pertinent literature but in the depth and scope of the study (which included school jurisdictions from across the United States) not to mention the reputation and experience of the authors, I felt that the RAND study was significant enough to replicate in Alberta. Thus, the overall procedures were guided by the RAND Study but some alterations were made in order that it might be realistically handled by a single researcher.

Thesis Organization

Chapter 2 - Review of the Literature

This chapter's main objective is to identify the characteristics of an effective program for teacher evaluation. Important definitions and concepts will be

reviewed and some historical background on teacher evaluation in Alberta will be provided. Canadian and American literature is reviewed to examine commonalities as they relate to effective teacher evaluation programs.

Thus the literature review provides theoretical and pragmatic standards against which the findings of this case study can be compared.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

This study was divided into two phases in which multiple methods of data collection are used. The first phase was a mailed survey questionnaire which was sent to 116 superintendents in Alberta who constituted the total population. The second phase of the research project was a case study of one of the school districts identified in Phase 1 as having an effective teacher evaluation program. The focal school district was determined by a frequency count of nominations made by the superintendents returning the questionnaire. In Phase 2, interviewing, document gathering, observation, and daily journal entries were used to provide a "rich" or "thick" description of an effective district program for teacher evaluation.

Chapter 4 - Findings

First, responses of the superintendents to the survey questionnaire in Phase 1 were subjected to content analysis

in order to develop a composite perspective of teacher supervision as viewed by superintendents in Alberta. The findings are then compared to the criteria uncovered in the review of the literature. Then the interviews with the personnel of the chosen school jurisdiction, supplemented by data from documents and observations, are subjected to content analysis. This procedure allows for triangulation of the common elements. The finished product is an in-depth description of teacher evaluation practices in one school district, a case study in which the details and particulars speak for themselves. A final summary of what the personnel interviewed in the case study felt are the strengths and weaknesses of that school district's teacher evaluation program is presented.

Chapter 5 - Analysis of Findings

The findings of this research project are analysed in three different ways. First, a comparison of the results of the case study will be made against the findings of the superintendents survey and the review of the literature. Second, the teacher evaluation policies will be compared to the teacher evaluation program as perceived from the interviews. Finally, a review of the success of the implementation of the teacher evaluation program will be carried out.

Chapter 6 - Summary, Implications and Recommendations

This chapter summarizes the findings and the implications of these findings to theory and research. In conclusion some recommendations for the use of the findings by administrators in their individual school jurisdictions are presented and some suggestions for future research.

The findings may aid superintendents in assessing their teacher evaluation program by providing guidelines for the development, review, evaluation, and possible revision of their local teacher evaluation programs. The reader, of course, is responsible for determining which parts of the case study are pertinent to their respective situations as every jurisdiction must consider its teacher evaluation program in light of local conditions and variables.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The main objective of this chapter is to identify the criteria that characterize an effective program for teacher evaluation. In order to accomplish this objective some groundwork must be laid. First, by way of introduction, a brief overview of the current status of teacher evaluation will be followed by a more detailed summary of the Alberta situation. Second, a conceptual framework will be developed which will include definitions and explanations of basic concepts that must be considered in developing a teacher evaluation program. Third, a review of American Literature is used to identify characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program. The focus of this review will be the RAND Corporation study compiled by Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Berstein (1985). Fourth, Canadian literature, with emphasis on Alberta, will be reviewed and a comparison will be drawn between it and the American scene. Fifth, the comparison between American and Canadian Literature will be condensed into table form in order to summarize the principles and characteristics that seem to create an effective teacher evaluation program.

Status of Teacher Evaluation

Scriven's (1981:244) claim that "teacher evaluation is a disaster" has received wide support among educators, politicians, and parents across North America. As stated by Stodolsky (1984:11), "heightened pressure for teacher evaluation was coincident with the accountability movement that gained momentum in the early 1970's." The Stull Act in California and laws in Connecticut seem to be representative of the beginning of recent concerns for teacher evaluation. At present in the United States, most states have mandated teacher evaluation. In Canada, some provinces have followed suit. As the Deputy Minister of Education in Manitoba, R.J. Duhamel (1983:10) stated:

> Whenever serious problems such as financial cutbacks and decreasing pupil enrollment surface and receive more than their usual amount of attention, the question of teacher evaluation is sure to emerge as well. The public pressure for higher standards in education, teamed with the demand for accountability at every level of authority, emphasizes the ever-present threat that tomorrow the evaluator's decision will trigger a layoff. It is no small wonder that an anti-evaluation sentiment rages in the hearts of teachers.

Similar concerns in Alberta have been translated into action. As indicated in the letter from the Deputy Minister, R. A. Bosetti, January 31, 1985 (Appendix 2) was given as the deadline for the implementation of teacher evaluation in accordance with the Management and Finance Plan (1985:50) which is outlined in the teacher evaluation section. The relevant policy statement in the MFP (1985:50)

reads,

> The performance of individual teachers and the quality of teaching practices across the province will be evaluated to assist in the provision of effective instruction to students and in the professional growth and development of teachers.

This statement seems to indicate concern for teacher development but many feel that competence is really the prime concern. Whatever the purpose, the responses from the many stakeholders -- including teachers, administrators, government, and parents -- reveal an underlying dissatisfaction or concern for the present state of affairs in the monitoring of teacher competence. Although evaluation has been mandated by the province, the local school board is still responsible for developing and implementing a teacher evaluation program (albeit under government scrutiny) and some educators do not feel this is sufficient. Duncan (1986:28), for example, states, "locally developed policies are just not effective in assuring that a thorough job of teacher evaluation is being done!" He suggests that what is needed is even more specific legislation to ensure "consistency of practice across the province...".

Recent Historical Developments in Alberta

> Like any other endeavor in the public arena, supervision is subject to the ebb and flow of policy and politics. Educational goals and instructional priorities habitually are readjusted to fit the changing times. Thus, schooling - and therefore

> supervision - invariably reflect social concerns and societal trends. (Rubin, 1982:170)

This has certainly been the case in Alberta in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Possibly influenced by the accountability movement in the United States and the Keegstra Affair, government influence has been extensive. As outlined in Hodgson (1980) and Byrne (1967), the decentralization of education, the change to local superintendents from department inspectors, and the extra workload on the superintendent all contributed to the reduction of actual visits to individual classroom. Thus, a void was created that would be open to criticism. All that was needed to create a furor in the education system was an incident of mammoth proportions.

It should be mentioned, before discussing the Keegstra case, that efforts to fill in the obvious weaknesses in judging teacher competence in Alberta were being addressed by the Alberta Teacher's Association (ATA) and the Department of Education in on-going discussion on a new Teaching Profession's Act (T.P.A.). However, because of the different points of view, the new T.P.A. had been put on a "back-burner" for a number of years.

With the disastrous developments of the "Keegstra Affair" as outlined in Hodgson (1984), David (1983) and Bergman (1985) and some public pressure on the Minister of Education, a number of programs to regulate teacher competency were implemented by the Department of Education.

The establishment of the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards (COATS) (Ministerial Order 75/85, 1985), the evaluation section of the M.F.P., and the formation of the Ghitter Committee to investigate tolerance and understanding are examples of this swift action. Beginning in the fall of 1985, school jurisdictions began planning, implementing, evaluating, and refining their teacher supervision policies and programs to meet the new mandated guidelines.

It should be noted, however, that although teacher evaluation was not legislated before 1984, many school jurisdictions did have evaluation programs already in operation. However, it seems that the political winds in favor of accountability from the influential United States and the "hot" blast from the unfortunate incidents in Eckville have brought teacher evaluation to the forefront in Alberta.

The Department of Education has developed policies that mandate teacher evaluation and has delegated the responsibility to the local school board as outlined in the M.F.P. (1985:50). This mandated minimal level, coupled with many of the school boards' attempts to make their programs do more than just satisfy government policies has led to a desire to develop effective teacher supervision programs. This study will address the development of this type of teacher evaluation program.

With this concern in mind, a discussion of the

problems encountered by local school jurisdictions in implementing an effective teacher supervision or evaluation program is outlined in the review of literature -- with the overarching objective being the development of a useful guide for teacher evaluation policy implementation.

Before an extensive review of the literature is considered, a conceptual framework will be constructed. A number of definitions of the terms that are problematic will be given and some basic concepts that must be addressed by educators as a basis for the establishment of teacher evaluation programs will be presented.

Conceptual Framework

Definitions

The first definition to be considered is the term *effective*. This term is difficult to explain because it has various meanings for each of the stakeholders in the teacher evaluation discussion. However, I will use the term to indicate the degree of satisfaction for each group involved and the extent to which the expectations of each group are met. In other words, *effective* will be used to indicate that at least minimal satisfaction in fulfilling teacher evaluation has been attained.

The next term is *supervision*. As Harris (1985:10) defines it,

> supervision of instruction is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching processes employed to promote pupil learning ... supervision of instruction is directed toward both maintaining and improving the teacher-learning processes of the school.

This is a broad and all-encompassing definition which includes tasks such as developing curriculum, organizing instruction, providing staff materials and facilities, and developing public relations, as well as evaluating instruction. In this paper supervision will be used in a slightly narrower sense, but referring to both summative and formative evaluation of teachers.

Before defining *formative* and *summative evaluation*, a brief comment should be made on the perceived difficulty in using these terms. Hickcox (1985:19) states:

> Michael Scriven, I think, coined these [summative and formative] types of evaluation just described, i.e., evaluation for improvement and evaluation for making final judgments. The concepts have served extremely well and passed into the consciousness of a generation of educators. But I think they have outlived their usefulness and have taken on connotations that are not helpful.

He goes on to explain that all evaluation includes judgments and that summative has taken on the "nasty things that administrators do to teachers" connotation. Formative appears to indicate "don't worry about it, nothing will happen." Notwithstanding their limitations, these terms will be used to conveniently distinguish between these two distinct purposes of evaluation. Thus formative evaluation

will include all those activities that are used to try to improve teaching or to help teachers develop their classroom skills. Summative evaluation will be used to indicate those activities carried out by supervisors when making judgments about teachers for promotion, placement, hiring, and firing.

The final term that will be defined is *program*. Although there can be interaction between administrators and teachers on an informal basis, a program is limited to those activities that have been planned, organized, and implemented according to some preset policies or written documents.

Concepts

Before any program or policy can be implemented, it must be considered in relation to some very basic underlying concepts. Darling-Hammond, Wise, and Pease (1983) state that before we design and implement a teacher evaluation program, we must research teaching, organizational behavior, and policy implementation in order to better understand teaching as work and the process of effecting change. These ideas must be explicit and part of our methods of evaluation in order to meet educational goals, organizational needs, and evaluation purposes (1983:285).

A detailed discussion of all of the above concepts is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, some will be briefly outlined to indicate that school jurisdictions, in

their plans to develop teacher supervision programs, must consider these concepts and at least address, if not come to a consensus on, their meanings, and must adhere to them in their policies.

One of the first questions is *Why evaluate?* Darling-Hammond et al (1983:302-303) suggested a model that seems to deal effectively with this question. They outline the four basic purposes: improvement (formative) for either the organization or individual or accountability (summative) for the individual or the organizations. These are not mutually exclusive, as there is overlap, and the authors also caution that "...an emphasis on one may tend to limit the pursuit of another " (1983:303). These concerns must be recognized before a system of evaluation is adopted.

Michael Knapp (1982:5) discussed the concept of a successful evaluation but as perceived by each stakeholder. He stated:

> First, those being evaluated - the teachers - have a stake in maintaining their jobs as well as their sense of self-respect and efficacy. They and the (unions that represent them) want an evaluation system that protects their rights, respects the complexity of their task, and supports their efforts toward meaningful individual solutions of teaching problems.

He then considers the evaluators' point of view:

> Second, the evaluators - the administrators - have a stake in keeping their organizations running smoothly. For them, the political and practical feasibility of the teacher evaluation system weigh heavily. People with management responsibility rightfully balance gain in instructional quality or public confidence against cost in time, expertise, or staff morale.

Finally, he summarizes the parents' viewpoint:

> Third, parents tend to be oriented toward the "bottom line" of student performance. They want a system that guarantees a successful school experience for their children. These three perspectives struggle to be reflected in the teacher evaluation system, which is the joint result of all three.

The next major concerns are *How will evaluation take place?* and *What will be the processes and methods?* These questions have a broad range of answers from one particular method to a combination of several methods. These include teacher interviews, competency tests, classroom observations, student ratings, student achievement, peer evaluation, and other indirect means such as professional commitment or involvement. Darling-Hammond et al seem to favor a multi-method system. They (1983:308) state:

> The generally low levels of reliability, generalizability, and validity attributed to teacher evaluation methods suggest that unidimensional approaches for assessing competence, performance, or effectiveness are unlikely to capture enough information about teaching attributes to completely satisfy any of the purposes for teacher evaluation.

Stark and Lowther (1984:76) agree: "...teacher evaluation may require multifaceted approaches that recognize varied teacher needs and backgrounds."

Closely connected to how teacher evaluation is to be conducted, is the question *Who will carry it out?* Again the literature suggests numerous alternatives. The principal seems to be a logical choice, and in most instances is considered the key in the evaluation (Anzaldua, 1984; Fris, 1983; Huddle, 1985; McLaughlin 1984). However, a few like Scriven (1981) feel students should be the key

evaluators. Epstein (1985) feels that parents as well as principals are important. Some visualize peers or colleagues in a "clinical" mode as important, while others feel superintendents or outside evaluators are the answer.

Probably the most controversial issue in teacher evaluation is *What will be evaluated?* Historically, as Wood and Pohland (1983) discovered by surveying instruments used in the past, the assessment of personal characteristics (presage) variables has in the past and still is the major approach to the evaluation of teachers. Instructive and administrative roles (process) variables were second. Student outcomes (product) were used very infrequently; in fact, they state (1983:178), "student outcome data has never been seriously used as a measure of teaching competence." Hickcox (1983:26) agrees: "less attention has been paid to product criteria -- we have been reluctant to use student achievement measures to make judgments about teachers."

Again, there is a great diversity among educators as to what should be evaluated. Disciples of Madeline Hunter's Effective Teacher Methods would see her process as focusing attention on the most important criteria. Teaching methods have also been extensively researched in Project Quest, conducted in Alberta in 1977-78. The results of this research was the development of 28 strategies which was used to study pupil achievement (Mackay, 1979:28-29). These strategies form the basis of a recent attempt by Alberta Education to assist school jurisdictions in defining and

improving teacher performance: Dr. Laurie Mireau (1985) moderates a set of video tapes entitled "Evaluation and Improving Teaching Performance". However, there is a need for school jurisdictions to develop their own unique sets of criteria to try to describe minimum levels of effective teaching. As Wise et al (1985) have stated:

> Teaching research has demonstrated that effective teaching behaviors vary for different grade levels, subject areas, types of students, and instructional goals. Thus assessments of relative teacher competence cannot be made on the basis of highly specified, uniform criteria.

In a similar vein Webb (1983) has also cautioned that no one set of criteria will be sufficient:

> There is no clear definition of what characterizes an effective teacher or constitutes effective teaching and, consequently, no definitive measures to be used for teacher evaluation. Any evaluation process is essentially a comparison of desired outcomes with actual outcomes.

Currently, with the concern for achievement and excellence, the product, that is student achievement, may gain some importance in the future evaluation of teaching. Thus it seems that a school jurisdiction must decide on the particular mix of the three variables in teacher evaluation -- process, product, and presage -- which are appropriate to its situation.

Another concept that must be addressed is the idea of *teaching as work*. Before a teacher evaluation program is established, the act of teaching must be defined and the criteria against which a teacher is judged outlined. A number of authors have delved into this topic. Eisner

(1983), believes that teaching is an art and a craft. Darling-Hammond et al (1983) add two more dimensions to Eisner's art and craft, namely labour and profession. These conceptions or metaphors do not exist in pure form but portions are found in many teaching acts. School districts need to clarify and identify their concept of teaching as work in order to provide a basis for evaluating teachers.

For example, if a school district sees teaching as labour, then they will view the evaluator as a supervisor and the student as raw material. This concept will thus affect and somewhat determine the evaluation process and criteria. Similarly, if teaching is considered a craft, the evaluator may be seen as a manager. If it is considered a profession then the evaluator may be considered an administrator. Finally, if teaching is considered an art then the evaluator may well be seen as a leader. The particular manner in which administrators and evaluators of the school jurisdiction view teaching will govern their attitudes toward the evaluation of teaching.

Along with the concept of teaching as work, the conceptualization of schools as organizations must also be discussed. The beliefs of the stakeholders about how schools as organizations operate will influence how teacher evaluation will be planned and implemented. One model views schools in a very rational manner; it outlines schools as closed systems and having the characteristics of a bureaucracy and tight coupling throughout the system. An

other model views schools as natural systems, open and with loose coupling throughout (Darling-Hammond et al,1983). Either concept will effect how teacher evaluation will be conducted.

Other organizational considerations are the roles of personnel at the different organizational levels in decision making, the resulting climates which influence communications, and the willingness of teachers and principals to co-operate in making changes. School jurisdictions must come to some understanding of their organizational makeup and how it may influence the teacher evaluation system. Darling-Hammond et al(1983) summarize:

> The choice of a teacher evaluation process is . . . associated with views of teaching and of the school as an organization, although quite often these associations are made only implicitly in evaluation decision making.

The final concept that must be considered is the *process of change*. In many cases, the establishment and implementation of teacher evaluation policies and programs are planned changes. Fullan (1982) outlines in great detail the factors that affect the change process and implementation of change. He concludes that any change is very complex and dependent on local conditions. The findings of Berman and McLaughlin (1980:70) suggest that "local factors", "mutual adaptation", and "supportive institutional environment" were necessary for a project to be effectively implemented and "to take root". Fullan's

list of factors is much more extensive (15 factors) and much too detailed for inclusion in this review. Thus, in their plans for a teacher evaluation program educational administrators must include considerations for the factors that affect change and implementation.

To summarize the discussion, the concepts that must be dealt with before an effective teacher supervision program can be implemented appear to be dependent on local variables, values, and conditions. As stated by Stodolsky (1984:11), teacher evaluation is very much "context bound". The remaining portion of this chapter will deal with the specific criteria or characteristics that seem to be related to the effectiveness of a teacher evaluation program.

American Scene

A recent study prepared for the National Institute of Education by the Rand Corporation (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, Bernstein, 1984) identified four local education authorities (L.E.A.) which seemed to have developed their own unique forms of teacher evaluation: Salt Lake City, Lake Washington, Greenwich, and Toledo.

The Salt Lake situation had produced a program which attempted "...to balance democratic governance and centralized management" (Wise et al, 1985:80). Teachers, along with their association, were given a key role in not only the implementation of the policy but in the evaluation

process itself. In return the board was given a free hand in the dismissal of any teacher who, after receiving remedial assistance, did not meet minimal standards. The situation was unique because of the Morman Community values which use the concept of shared governance. The goal of making personnel decisions in the name of accountability were explicitly stated, which was also unique.

Lake Washington was different in its engineering approach and integrated systems model. With the use of Madeline Hunter's theories, key teaching skills were defined and the process of evaluation was highly structured. In Lake Washington, the principal is the key figure in the operation of the program. His prime role is the identification of unsatisfactory teachers and the development of programs for remediation. The development of competent teachers is a priority (Wise et al, 1985:80-82).

Greenwich, Connecticut, used a managerial orientation based on incentives. The use of management by objectives, which includes self-evaluation and goal setting by teachers, is the basis for this program. Again, the principal and the training or in-service of both teachers and evaluators are the keys. There is an understanding that evaluation cannot be done overnight and that the ratio of evaluators to teachers must be reasonable. (Wise et al 1985:82-84)

The fourth case was Toledo, a union town, which developed an evaluation process around an intern or first year intervention program. The Toledo program is heavily

influenced by the public demand for quality control. The main difference from the other cases was that experienced teachers were used to evaluate first-year teachers and tenured teachers who were having difficulties. The expressed purpose of this program was to help promote professional growth. However, the program is used to make personnel decisions. There is a definite compromise between union and management, to provide a system that protects teachers and at the same time allows management to take action to deal with incompetent teachers (Wise et al, 1985:84-86).

The RAND study concentrated on four factors: organizational commitment, evaluator competence, collaboration, and strategic compatibility. The five conclusions that resulted from this study (Wise et al, 1985:103-113) are as follows. First, the teacher evaluation program "must suit the educational goals, management style, conception of teaching, and community values of the school district" (1985:103). Second, their is a great need for support from leaders, for "top-level commitment to and resources for evaluation outweigh checklists and procedures" (1985:104). Third, "the school district must decide the main purpose of its teacher evaluation system and then match the process to the purpose" (1985:106). Fourth, to maintain commitment and support, "teacher evaluation must be seen to have utility, which in turn depends on the efficient use of resources to achieve reliability, validity, and

cost-effectiveness" (1985:108). Finally, "teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation" (1985:110). These recommendations constitute a model for the development of an effective teacher evaluation program. However, the authors (1985:103) caution readers on their use:

> Educational policies and procedures must be tailored to local circumstances. Our conclusions and recommendations, therefore, may be best thought of as heuristics or starting strategies, to be modified on the basis of local experience.

Thomas McGreal in his book Successful Teacher Evaluation, deals with the problem of teacher evaluation and states that it is not always the actual evaluation that is the problem, but the system (1983:vii). He introduces his ideas by stating that two main issues must be addressed. First, there must be congruence between the desired goals and purposes and the activities in which people are actually involved. Second, all members of the system must be trained and given guided practice (1983:ix).

McGreal's background and practical knowledge, gained from working with over 300 school districts over an eight year period, have led him to the development of eight conditions or "commonalities" that he felt will increase significantly the chances of developing a realistic and effective teacher evaluation system.

His eight commonalities can be grouped under three main headings: the Framework for Building, Focusing Activities, and Training of Staff. The eight points are as

follows:

Framework

1. An appropriate attitude toward evaluation must be developed and the purpose must be seen as beneficial by both teachers and administration (1983:2-7).

2. An evaluation model must be complementary to the desired purpose of the evaluation. McGreal gives examples such as the common-law, goal-setting, product, clinical supervision, artistic, or naturalistic models. Again, it is most important to make a choice compatible with the local situation (1983:8-35).

3. Separation of administrative and supervisory behavior is felt to be important. In other words, separate formative evaluation from summative and also have each fulfilled by a different person (1983:37-41).

Focusing Activities

4. Goal setting and planning are major prerequisites to establishing an evaluation program. There are numerous planning methods and objectives, for example, management by objectives, performance objectives, or practical goal-setting. Administrators must realize that the planning method or objectives chosen are not as important as the realization that performance does not improve by accident but is planned (1983:44-69).

5. A narrow focus for evaluation must be fostered. This means that teaching must be considered to involve some specific skills which can be taught and evaluated. Some

examples listed are the development of a classroom climate, the ability to plan lessons and programs, and the management of classroom activities. These types of skills must become the focus of evaluating a teacher's performance (1983:70-95).

6. Classroom observation skills must be improved by training and practice. McCreal's four tenets for classroom observation (1983:97) are as follows. First, the reliability and usefulness of classroom observations increases with pre-observation information. Second, the evaluator should have a narrower focus for the observation to ensure accuracy in the description of the classroom events. Third, the relationship between the supervisor and teacher, as well as the willingness of the teacher to participate, may depend on how the data are recorded. Fourth, that same relationship and willingness to participate may also depend on how feedback is presented by the evaluator. The value of these tenets is that classroom observation becomes meaningful not only to the teacher being evaluated but also to the evaluator (1983:96-123).

7. The use of additional sources of data is another important option. McCreal lists some that have already been mentioned, such as parent, peer, students, self-evaluation as well as the use of student outcomes (product) and the collection of artifacts such as lesson plans. These are used to supplement classroom observations and can provide a better overall picture of a teacher's performance

(1983:125-142).

Training the Staff and Starting the System

8. The training program must be complementary to the evaluation system (1983:144-147).

In conclusion, McGreal suggests that these are not the only factors and that they may not all be present in one system at one time. He states (1983:x):

> ...it is not necessary that all eight commonalities be present before a system can be judged effective or potentially effective. Indeed, only a handful of schools have evaluation systems that reflect all eight. These commonalities can be and have been best used to provide a perspective: an awareness of alternatives and, if need be, a set of directions to follow.

McGreal, like the authors of the Rand Study, cautions that any evaluation system must be developed in light of local conditions, interests, and concerns.

Now, to summarize the American literature on the elements that seem necessary for the implementation of an effective teacher supervisory program, I have used a modification of the Wise et al (1985) study.

Firstly, it seems that the goals, purposes, and procedures must be clearly established, that they be made explicit to all those involved (Wise et al (1985:103) and that they match the evaluation system. McGreal's fourth and fifth commonalities are captured by this first characteristic. Other authors who concur include Barber (1982), Braskamp et al (1984), Castetter (1981), Chirnside (1984), Evertson and Holley (1981), Freer and Dawson (1985),

Goens (1982), Huddle (1985), Larson (1984), Lewis (1982), MacNaughton et al (1984), Manatt in Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985), McKenna (1982), Medley et al (1983), Natriello and Dornsbusch (1981), Peterson and Peterson (1984), Prince (1985), and Shannon (1982).

Second, there must be commitment from the top levels of the school district. This must be a genuine commitment, not just on paper or in policy, but with funds and resources -- including time for in-service and evaluation itself. As Wise et al state (1985:104): "this commitment must outweigh checklists and procedures." In McGreal's book this is the first of his commonalities and seems basic to the commencement of a district wide program. Other authorities who agree include Anzaldua (1984), Bellon and Bellon (1982), Bellon (1982), Chirnside (1984), Goens (1982), Holley (1982), Huddle (1985), Lauro (1982), McLaughlin (1984), Manatt (1985), McNeil (1981), Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985).

Thirdly, there needs to be a level of competency for both evaluators and teachers being evaluated. This is necessary for the process to be valid and reliable and hence considered useful (Wise et al, 1985:108). McGreal (1983) outlines this in his sixth and eighth commonalities which he called improvement of classroom observation skills and a training program. This principle is supported by Armiger (1981), Barber (1982), Bellon and Bellon (1982), Churnside (1984), Evertson and Holley (1981), Holley (1982), Lauro

(1982), MacNaughton et al (1984), Manatt (1985), McLaughlin (1984), McNeil (1981), Shannon (1982), Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985).

The fourth characteristic of an effective teacher evaluation program which seems to be the most important is the need for collaboration between teachers and managers or administrators. Wise et al (1985:110) call it teacher involvement and responsibility. McGreal (1983) sees it as part of his eight commonalities. Many other authors agree: Anzaldua (1984), Armiger (1981), Bellon (1982), Brodinsky and Neill (1983), Freer and Dawson (1985), Holley (1982), Huddle (1985), Larson (1984), Lewis (1982), Manatt in Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985), Manatt (1985), McLaughlin (1984), McNeil (1981), Natriello and Dornsbusch (1981), Popham (1971), Stiggins and Bridgeford (1985).

The fifth criterion for an effective program is the need for compatibility of two types: consistency within the program itself and consistency with other programing procedures and policies in the school district. Wise et al (1985:106) state "the school district must decide the main purpose of its teacher evaluation system and then match the process to the purpose." McGreal (1983:8) states, that it must be complementary to the desired purpose. Other authors like Barber (1982), Bellon and Bellon (1982), Braskamp et al (1984), Castetter (1981) and McLaughlin (1984) also agree that the teacher evaluation program must be integrated into the whole district program.

Another dimension of the compatibility concern is that the program must be considerate of local conditions, values, and factors. Wise et al (1985) found in their case studies that effectiveness can be accomplished in very diverse situations. McGreal (1983) certainly came to this conclusion after his experiences with a multitude of situations. Other authors are also of the opinion that local conditions, values, and factors must be taken into account: Armiger (1981), Barber (1982), Brodinsky and Neill (1983), Deal et al (1982), and Manatt in Stiggins and Bridgeford, 1985).

Canadian Scene

In Canada the concern for teacher evaluation has been felt across the country and some of the provinces have been moving to legislate control of teacher competency. Alberta has been particularly active in this regard. An indication that administrators are in fact deeply interested in this topic was demonstrated in the fall of 1985, when a conference on teacher evaluation was held at the University of Alberta sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa. The conference attracted hundreds of administrators and educators from across Alberta who were concerned with teacher evaluation.

One of the speakers at the conference was Dr. David Townsend, who had just completed a study which undertook "...to investigate, analyse, and document the process of

implementation of a new policy of teacher supervision and evaluation in the five secondary schools of Lethbridge School District No. 51 "(1984:i). For his study questionnaires were administered at intervals between October 1983 and May 1984. Observations of classrooms and interviews were also carried out on a daily basis during this period of time.

The findings led to eleven recommendations (1984:39-55) which may serve as a valuable guide for school jurisdictions in Alberta that are in the process of implementing new policies of teacher supervision and evaluation. They are summarized as follows: (1) teachers and administrators should be involved in the development of policies, (2) development and implementation of an evaluation program takes time, (3) teachers should understand the model being used to guide the evaluation before the program is implemented, (4) written policies should outline the process of evaluation, (5) in-service education should precede and accompany the implementation of teacher evaluation programs, (6) on-site training for both teachers and evaluators should be provided, (7) all resources available should be utilized, (8) the implementation process should be monitored, (9) administrators should review the structure and function of their offices to ensure efficency in meeting evaluation priorities, (10) considerations need to be made for the realities of the "work-life" of all educators, (11)

teacher evaluation policies need to be integrated with all other evaluation policies.

Townsend (1984:iii) concluded that the system in Lethbridge had been accepted by both teachers and administrators because it had tried to deal with both accountability and the need for professional development of the staff.

> The results of this study indicate [that] a fair degree of success has been achieved with the implementation of regular supervision of teachers in each of the five schools. High levels of acceptance and participation were recorded at key stages throughout the year. However, a majority of teachers and supervisors have identified the need for more training, and more involvement of district office personnel in the implementation next year, when expectation is that one-quarter of the district's teaching staff will receive formal evaluations.

Another major study carried out in 1983-84 by Andrew Duncan investigated formal teacher evaluation in the Lakeland Public School District. A questionnaire was used to collect data from superintendents, principals, and other central office personnel concerning factors, purposes, procedures, and outcomes of their last teacher evaluation. Duncan concluded that the existence of a written policy on formal teacher evaluation did not necessarily lead to quality or completeness of evaluation. In fact, Duncan (1984:20) feels that "school board policies may serve no useful purpose except to initiate teacher evaluation." He also states that there was not enough concern for due process and that in-service training of evaluators is below the minimum level deemed necessary to assure improvement in

instruction.

Duncan (1984:23-24) recommends that personnel who are university trained be hired to put a high priority on teacher evaluation. He states that in-service be given not only to evaluators but to classroom teachers for a better understanding of the evaluation process. Finally, he believes that the Department of Education should legislate policies to ensure that fair and consistent teacher evaluation is carried out in Alberta.

In a recent news report in the ATA News (1986:3), a report of the Committee on Implementing Teacher Evaluation Policies and Programs was announced. The committee's report was a joint effort between the ATA, The Conference of Alberta School Superintendents (CASS), Alberta Education, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Association of Private and Independent Schools, and the Universities.

A summary of the Advisory Committee's findings includes references to a number of significant evaluation program components. They are:

> A. The goals and aims of the evaluation program should be clearly defined and known by all participants.
> B. The evaluation policy and program should reflect a sound understanding of evaluation theory and practices.
> C. The evaluation program must be planned, developed, implemented and evaluated cooperatively.
> D. The major resource is the expertise of the evaluator. This expertise can only be developed through extensive training, experience and time.
> E. As the primary goal is to enhance effective teaching, one must be conscious of the pitfalls of teacher evaluation.
> F. Sometimes major problems will be encountered with teachers and appropriate action must be taken. Such problems include illegal behavior, personal

> misconduct, document falsification, contract violations, policy violations, or inadequate teaching performance.
> G. It is important to implement an administrator evaluation program along with the teacher evaluation program.(1986:1-5)

It should be noted that the ATA has for a number of years been concerned with teacher evaluation. In 1980 a position paper was submitted on teacher evaluation (Members' Handbook, 1985:180-182), which led to the passing of the ATA Policy Statements on Teacher Evaluation (Members' Handbook, 1985:158-160). The obvious thrust of these documents is to protect teachers' rights and to ensure due process, and to recognize the need for both formative and summative evaluation. They state that the former should be the priority and that a basic knowledge of the purposes, criteria, and procedures should be clear to all teachers and administrators involved in teacher evaluation.

By way of synthesis and for ease of discussion, the previously mentioned Alberta studies will be considered in light of the five conclusions outlined in the Rand study. Other Canadian literature will also be integrated.

The first requisite is the need for the goals, purposes, and procedures to be at least understood, if not agreed upon, by all personnel. The criteria for what constitutes effective teaching teacher should be spelled out. This concern is outlined in the MFP policy (1985:50), the Advisory Committee's Report (1986:1), Duhamel (1983), Duncan (1984), Fris (1983), Hickcox (1983), Lyons (1985),

Mireau (1983), Sweezey (1983), and Townsend (1984).

The next criterion is the need for commitment. As stated in Fris (1983:15), there is a need for both central office support and the key element, the principal's commitment. This essential involvement and genuine top level commitment is also viewed as important by the Advisory Committee (1986), Levin (1982), Mireau (1983), and Townsend (1984) as outlined in his second and seventh recommendations.

The competence of the evaluator is considered to be paramount in the research conducted by Duncan (1984). He also sees the need to educate teachers and he states (1984:24) "... school boards involve classroom teachers in those in-service programs so that they become more knowledgeable and committed to the processes of formal evaluation." The Advisory Committee (1986), Fris (1983), Hickcox (1983), Lyons (1985), Mireau(1983), and Townsend (1984) all agree that the training of personnel involved in the evaluation process needs to be addressed by local school jurisdictions.

The fourth commonality is the need for collaboration. As Sweezey (1983) stated, "there is need for involvement from the beginning by both teachers and supervisors." Everyone should participate in development of objectives and be clear on the rationale. The Alberta Department of Education also states collaboration is needed (MPP,1985:50); section 5(c) states "teacher evaluation policies should

permit consultation with teachers in the development of policy, guidelines, and procedures." The Advisory Committee (1986), Duhamel(1983), Duncan (1984), Hickcox (1985), Lyons (1985), and Townsend (1984) also agree on this point.

The last requisite is that of compatibility of the teacher evaluation program with other policies within the local board and the exigencies of the local situation. Townsend encapsulated this criterion very well in his last three recommendations. He states (1984:49-53) "school authorities should assess the appropriateness of the structure and function" of their organization in relation to teacher evaluation and the policies outlining teacher evaluation should "take into account the realities of the work-life of teachers and supervisors" and "be integrated into overall district processes".

Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program

It is apparent from recent literature and research projects that there are some basic criteria that must be met as a minimum for the development of an a effective teacher supervision or evaluation program. Harris (1985:1-24) sees evaluation as only a small part of the total supervision of personnel - teacher evaluation should not over-shadow the other important activities that are necessary for effective instruction, such as curriculum development, curriculum in-service, and the improvement of materials and resources.

Along with this requirement for an overall view of the total teaching process, there is a need for a review of research that is pertinent and applicable to the local school jurisdiction's situation. Not all research findings are valid for each circumstance and the use of common sense is very important to ensure that what some large, seemingly efficient school system has implemented is not blindly duplicated because it is easy or convenient. A detailed and extensive study of one's local situation must first be undertaken so that precepts found in research are adopted selectively and realistically to fit the local needs and conditions.

Sergiovanni (1982:67-78) also indicates a need to adjust teacher evaluation to more than simply one style. He discusses the need to align the scientific with the clinical and artistic views of teacher supervision. He states:

> Of concern is improving the practice of teachers and the quality of classroom life. Thus a key fourth question must be considered. Given what is (descriptive science), what ought to be (normative science), and what events mean (interpretive science), what should supervisors and teachers "do" (practice)? Theories of practice are ultimately concerned with action taken to improve a present situation and in our case the beneficiaries would be teachers and students. (1982:78)

The above mentioned needs, specifically the need to consider the total picture of supervision not just concentrating on evaluation, the need to use literature in light of local conditions, and the need to adjust evaluation to the many teaching styles encountered in the classroom are

all important. Table 2, summarizes the literature in simplified form and may be helpful as a checklist for reviewing and developing a teacher evaluation program. However, care must be taken in its use because in summarizing and condensing meaning is sometimes lost.

The characteristics in Table 2 will be used later in Chapter 4 to help compare the findings of the questionnaire sent out to superintendents (phase 1) and the results of the case study (phase 2).

Conclusion

Taking into account all the specific characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program outlined in the literature, the essential ingredient for the establishment of such a program is the development of a positive attitude by all concerned. This can only be achieved by creating a climate of trust. As stated by Jesse (1985:31),

> Trust can only be developed as a result of a meaningful and lasting relationship based upon openness and honesty - not a brutal honesty, without concern for feelings, but an honesty that incorporates feelings and aspirations. It is an honesty that provides alternatives, priorities, and a refocusing of efforts.

Along with the establishment of trust, the overall concern and objective in establishing a teacher supervision program was stated by Duhamel (1983:16): "it should only be undertaken so that our teachers and most particularly our pupils can ultimately benefit from its results".

Table 2

Comparison of RAND Study to other Literature.

	Rand Study				
	Consistency	Commitment	Competency	Collaboration	Compatibility
Other Authors					
1. McGreal	x	x	x		x
2. Other American Literature	18 articles	10 articles	11 articles	14 articles	8 articles
3. Townsend	x	x	x	x	x
4. Advisory Council	x	x	x	x	x
5. Program Policy Manual	x	x		x	
6. Other Canadian Literature	7 articles	3 articles	5 articles	5 articles	

Note x denotes agreement with the five RAND characteristics and numbers denote the number of articles in agreement with the RAND characterisitics.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the research design considerations and the data collection activities, which are divided into two sections and correspond to the two phases of the research project. The first phase consisted of a mailed survey questionnaire and the second phase a case study involving interviewing, document collection, and observation. The choice of school jurisdiction for the case study, the second phase, hinged on the outcome of the first phase. The following is a detailed description of the steps taken to complete each phase.

Design Considerations

The design of this study was influenced by a research project completed for the RAND Corporation by Wise et al, (1985) and a personal preference for working with people in a one-to-one, face-to-face situation. However, there were additional reasons which related more directly to research principles.

Eisner(1981:9) states, "the field of education in particular needs to avoid methodological monism. Our

problems need to be addressed in as many ways as will bear fruit." This research project, which utilized a broadly based questionnaire format and then enriched the data through a case study, may in fact avoid a form of research monism about which Eisner was concerned. Eisner (1981:9) provides further insight into research design by indicating that the dual approach - a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques - can achieve binocular vision, "looking through one eye never did provide much depth of field". The conduct of this study was designed to achieve some depth of field.

The characteristics of qualitative research matched the intended outcomes of the research project. As Guba and Lincoln (1982:372) outline, the case study can be used for several purposes. My purposes were to "describe", "make-clear", and "provide a sense of" the teacher evaluation program that was chosen.

Other characteristics of qualitative research that induced me to pursue the case study method are provided by Eisner (1981:6-9) who states ". . . a major focus in artistic approaches to research is the meaning and experience of the people who function in the cultural web one studies" and "artistic approaches to research are less concerned with the discovery of truth than with creation of meaning."

The reasons for my selection of the case study approach is provided in a comprehensive summary by Guba and

Lincoln (1982:375-376). The case study:

1. provides a "thick description" which allows the reader to determine "fittingness";
2. is grounded, provides an experiential perspective, and emerges from the context itself;
3. is "holistic", "lifelike" and can be "cast in natural language";
4. simplifies the range of data, is "streamlined", and essential information is conveyed in a focused conversation-like format;
5. focuses the reader's attention and illuminates meaning with "well-integrated statements that point out essentials (and their relationships) and disregards the remainder";
6. builds on the "tacit knowledge" of its reader, it has "naturalistic generalization".

The supporters of the quantitative (scientific) method cite problems in validity, reliability, and generalizability as reasons not to use qualitative (artistic) methods. These concerns will be addressed later in this chapter.

For clarification and as a final comment before outlining the actual steps taken to complete the case study, it is necessary to state that "the researcher's primary goal is to add to knowledge, not to pass judgment on a setting." (Bogdan and Biklen,1982:42)

Phase 1 - Questionnaire and Case Selection

Why choose a mailed questionnaire? Information was needed from superintendents in Alberta. The financial and time considerations resulting from the geographic locations of the multitude of school jurisdictions spread across Alberta led to the use of a mailed questionnaire. It was the quickest and cheapest method of reaching the respondents. As stated by Labaw (1980:144)

> ... a questionnaire is a means of communication between the researcher and respondent, (and) the ultimate goal of every questionnaire should be to provide a means of letting the respondent tell the researcher truthfully and as accurately as possible what the respondent knows, thinks, feels and does.

The steps for planning and mailing a questionnaire that are outlined in Borg and Gall (1983:415-435), were followed, not necessarily because it was the best or only method of conducting a survey questionnaire but because it provided a detailed plan that helped ensure effectiveness.

Objectives

As stated by Borg and Gall (1983:416) a researcher needs to establish the objectives of the questionnaire to insure effectiveness and "to make sound decisions regarding selection of a sample, construction of the questionnaire, and methods for analyzing the data".

The first objective of the questionnaire was determined by the fact that a research project was being

partially replicated. This project, (Wise et al, 1985) had been sponsored by the RAND Corporation and the results were felt to be relevant to the Alberta situation. The RAND report, as described in Chapter 2, was a case study of four effective local school authorities. The four effective systems were selected by a panel of eminent educators from a group of 32 school districts which had been previously studied and described. The four were chosen for their perceived effectiveness and diversity. However, in this instance the financial resources, time, and means to assemble a group of knowledgeable educators in the manner of the RAND report were not available; hence there was a need to develop a different means of selecting a school district for a case study.

The method adopted took the following form: a survey of all superintendents in Alberta was conducted in which they were asked to nominate a school jurisdiction (other than their own) which, in their opinion, had developed an effective program for teacher evaluation. A simple tally of the number of nominations given each school jurisdiction and the resulting rank order of school jurisdictions from most nominations to least would give an indication of an effective system as perceived by practising administrators. Superintendents were chosen as the respondents, first because of their government mandated responsibility to implement a teacher evaluation program, which meant they could be expected to have very current and relevant

knowledge about teacher evaluation; second because of their extensive educational experience, gained from years in an influential position; and third their greater opportunities to visit other school jurisdictions.

The second main objective of the survey was to identify a list of the criteria that, in the opinion of the superintendents, are hallmarks of an effective program for teacher evaluation. This data would be validated by a comparison against the results of the review of the literature and was in turn used to illuminate the data generated in the case study segment of the study.

Sampling

The selection of the respondents was influenced by the fact that the case study would be at the district/division/county level. Thus superintendents, being the leaders at this level of education, were the logical respondents. As the number of superintendents in Alberta approximates one hundred, it seemed reasonable to attempt to survey the total population. A mailing list was obtained from the Alberta Trustees' Association. In fact, the Alberta Trustees' Association provided a complete, up to date set of mailing labels of superintendents in Alberta and the Northwest Territories. In the end, the sample included 116 Alberta superintendents. As this sample was close to the population of superintendents, this reduced sampling bias or error.

Questionnaire Development

The type of questions were determined to some extent by the type of information required. Open-ended questions were chosen on the whole because they allow the respondent to be more spontaneous in providing data. An open-ended question, as indicated by Platek et al., (1985:35) "... allows the respondent to answer in his own way, creating his own response in words or numbers."

Open-ended questions present difficulties in organizing data, such as: the difficulty in coding and data analysis; respondents' different frames of reference; no control over the wording; vague or incomplete answers; poor handwriting, and possible misinterpretation of the question (Platek, 1985:37-45). However, the advantages seem to outweigh these limitations and include: allowing the respondents an opportunity for self-expression, stimulated free thought, wider range of answers, reduced answering for answer's sake, and a reduced chance that the researcher would influence or lead the respondents' answers by using closed type questions. In fact it was this type of information that was being sought - free, open opinion from superintendents. Thus all but one of the questions in the questionnaire were open-ended. (Appendix 3).

One question, item number three, was closed and was a multiple choice, Likert scale question. This item was intended to give a standard perspective on where each

superintendent felt his system stood in the development of a teacher evaluation program in relation to other school jurisdictions.

Questionnaire Format

The format of the questionnaire was developed with regard to the nature and number of questions (ie. open type questions and only five in number) and with guidance from the literature. Borg and Gall (1983:422) state "make the questionnaire attractive" and "organize and lay out questions so that the question is as easy to complete as possible." Cohen and Manion (1980:85) advise "clarity of wording and simplicity of design are essential." Hence, questions were kept simple and the instrument was limited to one page.

A draft questionnaire was reviewed and critiqued by several educators enrolled in the Masters Program in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. Based upon their comments, along with discussions with my thesis advisor, revisions were made which resulted in the final format. (Appendix 3).

The Letter of Transmittal

In developing the covering letter for the questionnaire (Appendix 4), a number of factors were considered. In this regard, guidance was taken from Borg

and Gall (1983:427-429) and Cohen and Manion (1980:86-87). The guiding principles were as follows:

1. Be neat and attractive.
2. Indicate the aim of the survey.
3. Convey to the respondent the importance or significance of the survey.
4. Assure confidentiality.
5. Be brief and to the point (one page if possible).
6. Use a letterhead if possible.
7. Use good quality stationery and photo copying.
8. Enclose a self addressed, stamped return envelope.
9. Make reference to the professional status of the respondent or the fact that their knowledge is important and cannot be gained elsewhere.
10. Associate the study with some professional organization (ie. University of Alberta, Department of Educational Administration) if possible.
11. Offer some incentive, not necessarily monetary (in this case the opportunity to receive a copy of the results of the study).
12. Indicate a time frame for completion (usually a week, not including mailing time, is sufficient) to increase urgency.

All of the above suggestions were incorporated into the covering letter.

Another technique used to increase the return rate and make it easier to identify non-respondents was the coding of

returns. A code number was placed on the return envelope which corresponded to a number on the mailing list of the 116 superintendents. This code number was used to reduce the time and expense of sending follow-up letters to all of the original sample.

Follow-up Letter

A follow-up letter (Appendix 5) was developed and sent out about four weeks after the original covering letter. Many of the same techniques and considerations were used in writing the follow-up letter as were used in the original covering letter. Additionally, the follow-up letter re-emphasized the importance of the study and the value of the respondent's participation (Cohen and Manion,1980:87). However, a somewhat different emphasis and wording was used from that in the original letter (Borg and Gall, 1983:431).

Both Borg and Gall and Cohen and Manion claim that the first follow-up letter can produce a 20% increase in the number of responses. However, it is the whole process of planning for a mailed questionnaire and the implementing of that plan that produce the necessary results. Many questionnaires, including those used by prestigious organizations, achieve less then a 50% return rate. A 70% to 80% rate is considered successful and the goal to be set. In this study there was a return rate of 70%. More details will be outlined in Chapter 4.

Phase 2 - Case Study

Gaining Access

After tabulating the results of question #2 of the survey, an obvious first choice as candidate for the case study emerged. (Note, the school jurisdiction that received the most nominations also had a reputation for effectiveness that had been mentioned in previous conversations with governmental personnel and senior educators.) The question then was, "How to gain permission to carry out research in this school jurisdiction?" A phone call was made to the superintendent in which a brief overview of the project was outlined and the reason for choosing that district was given. A subsequent meeting was arranged.

Before the meeting a detailed plan was drafted (Appendix 6) in which a schedule of the field work, examples of interview questions, documentation, and a proposed list of possible respondents to be interviewed were outlined. This plan was developed utilizing considerations outlined in Bogdan and Biklen (1982:123-125) and Jaeger (1980).

At the meeting, the plan was discussed. Tentative agreement of the superintendent was received and dates scheduled. A request was made for documents, including board policies on teacher evaluation and school reviews, to be sent to the me along with a letter of verification. With agreement for the study to proceed, the next step was to prepare for the actual fieldwork.

Preliminary Preparations
- Pilot Study

The importance of pilot testing or carrying out an actual pilot study cannot be over-emphasized (Borg and Gall,1983:100-101). The testing of interview questions is very necessary and so is the equipment. In fact two major problems were alleviated because they were encountered in the pilot study. First, the microphone that was being used was run on batteries (the first interview was not recorded) and this reminded the researcher that periodic checks should be made during the interviews to ensure that they are in fact being recorded. Second, it was discovered that an extension cord was a definite necessity as wall sockets frequently are inaccessible or already have an electronic octopus attached.

The pilot study was carried out in the school where I had previously taught. The proposed interview questions were tested on the principal, vice-principal, and three teachers. Each was interviewed in his/her own office or classroom using a tape-recorder. An introductory routine was practised and questions were rehearsed. Upon completion of the interview, respondents were asked to provide comments or suggestions that they felt would improve the questions or techniques used in the interview -- ie. Did the questions address the purpose that was intended? Did they uncover the information necessary to describe the interviewee's impression of teacher evaluation? Did the person feel at

ease? The feedback from these interviews provided suggestions for some minor changes in the questions and reminders to speak slowly and clearly; give respondents time to think about their answer; not to allow the seating arrangement to put barriers between interviewer and respondent; and, finally, to select a quiet, private room to conduct the interviews.

After redrafting the interview questions, I was prepared for the field. But are you ever truly totally prepared for any eventuality? Although a plan is essential, the need to be flexible is also important. Bogdan and Biklen (1982:55-56) indicate that plans provide guidelines and direction on how to proceed. In qualitative research, the design is flexible rather then nonexistent. "Qualitative researchers go off to study carrying the mental tools of their trade, with plans formulated as hunches, only to be modified and remolded as they proceed" and "design decisions are made throughout the study".

Fieldwork

Arrival.

> You arrive, tape recorder in hand, with a grin ridgidly planted on your face. You probably realize that you have no idea how the grin is being interpreted, so you stop and nervously attempt a relaxed pose. Then you realize that you have no idea how that is being interpreted. Soon you work yourself into the paralysis of the psychiatrist in a strip joint - she knows she can't react. It is little wonder that people sometimes hide in a hotel and read mysteries. (Agar,1980:83)

Notwithstanding having had the opportunity to pilot test, the first few hours in any new situation always have their uneasy moments, especially if you are using the "lone-ranger" approach to research: "That is, the researcher singlehandedly faces the empirical world, going off alone to return with the results" (Bogdan and Biklen,1982:72). My experience was no exception. Meeting the superintendent and the other members of the central office staff was like being hit with a ten foot wave on a beach. By the time all the names bounce off, one is stunned. However, there were a few techniques which seemed to help overcome the "first-day jitters".

The first task was the need to establish rapport with a key person or "gate-keeper" (Bogdan and Biklen,1982:121), who in this case was the superintendent because he not only held the power to determine access to the schools in the district but gave legitimacy and some credibility to my presence in the district. In fact, the superintendent had set up contact persons and tentative meeting times with each principal of the schools to be visited. The first morning at coffee the personnel at central office were informed of my purpose for visiting the school division but I was left to my own devices with regard to arranging interview times. Some central office personnel were not at coffee that first morning and thus were not introduced. They were the most difficult to schedule an interview with.

However, as the superintendent is a very busy person

and is not always available to answer questions, his secretary provided an excellent contact person. She helped immensely in providing directions to schools, names and phone numbers, message service, and the general moral support which was sorely needed in those first few days.

It is clear that the first day was of most importance to the study because it had the potential to make the difference between successful data collection and reluctance by respondents to cooperate. Bogdan and Biklen (1982:127) offer some suggestions which I found particularly useful in making this experience most effective. They suggest:

1. Do not take what happens in the field personally.
2. Set up your first visit so someone is there to introduce you.
3. Don't try to accomplish too much the first few days.
4. Remain relatively passive (but show interest and enthusiasm).
5. Be friendly.

Above all they suggest that the researcher try to maintain a low profile, so as to disrupt and influence the respondents as little as possible.

As has already been mentioned, any research plan, especially once the researcher is in the field, had to be flexible. When dealing with people with their own personal agenda, priorities, and the chance of unforeseeable natural events, if something can go wrong it will; thus being

prepared to make adjustments to your plans is paramount. In the case of this study, I failed to plan for a major blizzard in the middle of May - a definite flaw in the research plan, especially considering the fact that this research was being conducted in Alberta. This resulted in the research being conducted in four days over a two week period instead of four consecutive days.

Sampling. The sampling was not strictly random. However, in view of the fact I had to interview teachers and administrators who were involved in their normal everyday jobs, daily routines, and the ethical consideration of minimal disruption, different sampling techniques were definitely required. This seems to be a form of volunteer sampling as cited by Borg and Gall (1983,251-255).

The importance of the superintendent selecting principals from five schools (two elementary, two junior-high, and one senior-high school) and arranging meeting times can only be appreciated in the light of the final implementation of the research plan and the choosing of the sample of teachers to be interviewed.

The choosing of the five schools and their principals was completed by the superintendent before I arrived. The only specific direction that was imposed on the superintendent was the research design plan to have samples at each school level (ie. elementary, junior, and senior high schools). (It should be noted that this school jurisdiction has only one high school.) This represents a

form of quota sampling outlined in Cohen and Manion (1980:116) and internal sampling as outlined in Bogdan and Biklen (1982:63). That is to say, the sample was chosen to narrow the focus of the study and ensure that the particular categories (stakeholders) are represented in the sample.

One other comment is necessary with reference to sampling. On the request of the superintendent, all central office administrators involved in teacher evaluation were interviewed. This represents the total population of central office staff.

Once I had arrived at a school (usually preceded by a phone call to the principal to verify arrangements) and had met with and interviewed the principal, another form of sampling was used. This form is what Cohen and Manion (1980:76) would call a convenience sample. Teachers in each school were interviewed, if and when available. That is to say, any teacher who was free from classroom responsibility at a particular time was a candidate for an interview. With limitations on time for interviews and the concern to disrupt operations as little as possible, this seemed to be the most suitable form of sampling under the circumstances.

Interviews. In this study, interviewing was used as the primary data collection technique. A semi-structured interview was used. This meant that a question schedule was implemented as a guide, but questions were open-ended and there was ample opportunity for me to probe the respondents for clarification and enrichment of their answers (Bogdan

and Biklen,1982:132). The interview was focused in the sense that the topic was teacher evaluation and the information that was being sought was the respondents' impressions on this topic.

The rationale for choosing this interview format was the desire to gain information that was enriched with the respondents' perspectives, details, and examples. This information could possibly have been gained from a written questionnaire, but the "face to face" approach of interviewing increases the opportunity for gaining insight into the respondents' opinions by affording the chance to expand on the original questions. In other words, if the question as first asked did not bring a response or result in a "blank look", the researcher could rephrase or clarify the questions to ensure understanding. This cannot be accomplished in a mailed out questionnaire. The researcher understands that interviewing has some limitations. These are discussed later in the chapter under validity and reliability.

Prior preparation for the interview was essential. There are many sources that outline the points to remember to increase the chances of a successful interview. (Cohen and Manion, 1980:254-257; Engel and Friedrichs,1980:86-87; Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:136-139; Borg and Gall,1983:441-443) Some of the main suggestions followed were choosing a place to interview that was relatively free from distraction and interruptions, trying not to do too much talking, using

supportive techniques such as nods of the head, listening very carefully, being flexible, and trying to put the respondent at ease by using small talk or joking.

After an introduction of both parties and some small talk, a location was decided on and both parties moved there (some times the respondents were brought to me already set up in a private room). Once everyone was seated, permission was asked to use a tape recorder (if not already assembled, permission was asked before the recorder was set-up). Then, as outlined in Cohen and Manion(1980:256) the purpose of the interview and the researcher's role was explained, the method in which the findings would be reported and finally anonymity and confidentiality of the conversation was assured. At this point, the tape recorder was turned on.

The respondents were then asked to describe their background in education, including training and history with the Board. This question was a means of gaining necessary information to provide a context for the study, but also it helped to put the respondent at ease and 'warmed-up' for the remaining questions.

The questions were generally asked in the order outlined in the interview guide (Appendix 7). In some instances the questions were asked in a different order as the answer to one question led naturally to another. Some questions were eliminated when they did not pertain to the person being interviewed. Clarification and additional information were requested as needed. Near the end of the

interview, respondents were given the opportunity to add any additional comments on topics they thought had been missed. They were then thanked for their cooperation and informed that a summary of the study would be made available to them in the future. This routine was followed in interviews with all the respondents; teachers, in-school administrators, and central office administrators.

Document collection. A secondary source of information included the collection of official documents of the school board (ie. board policies, evaluation programs), school developed information pamphlets, brief field notes made after each interview, and two independent reports on evaluation procedures in the district. As well as documentation on the school district, information was gathered from City Hall on the local conditions and description of the community. This documentation was collected for two reasons. First, it was a way to provide a context to the case study which would help readers evaluate the results in relation to their own situations. This information, along with the impression that I received while visiting the shopping malls, parks, and campgrounds, as well as the schools, provided "rich" impressions to help describe the cultural context of the school district.

The second reason for gathering the information on official policy statements and program descriptions was that they represented an alternate source against which the descriptions given by the personnel who were interviewed

could be checked and verified, representing a form of triangulation.

Findings and Data Analysis

Phase 1 - Questionnaire

As the questionnaire (Appendix 3) was primarily open-ended questions, the findings were subjected to content analysis. However, frequency counts were also used to gain insight into numbers of respondents and responses.

The responses to question one, "What do you consider the hallmarks of an effective teacher supervision program? List the criteria below.", were placed individually on long sheets of lined paper under common headings or categories. These categories developed as the characteristics were grouped. In other words the categories were developed and refined as the regularities and patterns emerged (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:156). All responses were placed in one of the categories, none was disregarded. The responses seem to fall into two main groups: criteria that had consistent responses from a number of superintendents and responses that were diverse or different. The categories and groups are included in Chapter Four and examples are presented.

The second question, "Nominate one school jurisdiction in Alberta (other than your own) which you feel is characterized by your above criteria", was analysed by using

a frequency count of school jurisdiction nominated. Total numbers are reported in Chapter Four.

Question three, "How would you rate your school jurisdiction's teacher supervision program in comparison to the above criteria? (1.much more effective,2.more effective,3.equally effective,4.less effective,5.still developing)", was statistically analysed in order to give an overview of the current level of implementation and quality of teacher evaluation programs in Alberta as perceived by superintendents. Written comments will also be outlined in Chapter Four.

Question four, "If you have any additional comments regarding this survey, please indicate them below.", was an open question asking for further comments. These comments are included in Chapter Four as verbatim quotations.

The last questions was an optional opportunity for superintendents to receive a copy of the results of the completed study. A frequency count was carried out of those making requests in order to determine interest in this study in particular and possibly teacher evaluation in general.

Phase 2 - Case Study

The content analysis of the interviews recorded on cassette tapes followed the following steps. The tapes were first listened to on the evening of the day in which they were taped in order to help me refine my interview

techniques and to ensure that the tape recorder was indeed operating properly.

The tapes were later transcribed. Each interview was typed using double spacing on individual pages and identified by a letter to provide anonymity. Multiple copies of the transcripts were made and placed in various locations to provide insurance against lost or destruction. I then compared the transcripts to the tapes to ensure accuracy and to identify parts that had been missed or misinterpreted by the typist. All copies were then corrected. The transcripts were color coded according to the stakeholder groups: teachers (yellow), in-school administrators (red), central office administrators (blue), and superintendent (green). As I listened to the tapes, significant parts of the interviews were highlighted with the cooresponding colored highlight marker and a diary of comments and reflections of the process and content of the interview was maintained.

Once the transcripts had been color coded, each was cut up into the following ten categories which roughly corresponded to the interview questions:

1) personnel background information,

2) historical information,

3) developmental and implementation information,

4) present situation,

5) strengths,

6) weaknesses,

7) criteria for evaluating effective teaching,

8) the goals of education in the Red Deer Public District,

9) the future of the teacher evaluation in the Red Deer Public District, and

10) any additional comments.

It should be noted that as the transcripts were being cut-up and placed in each of the above ten categories according to the color coding of the four groups, the page number and identification letter was placed on the portion of the page to allow reference back to the original transcript.

With this raw data divided into categories and the significant comments highlighted (with the cooresponding colored highlighter) an outline of how the findings would be presented was developed. The format followed is outlined below and utilizes some verbatim comments in order to highlight the findings.

The format for reporting the results or findings of the case study (ie. interviews, documentation, and observations) was influenced by the fact that this research project was a partial replication of the RAND Corporation study on teacher evaluation, Wise et al(1985). The intent was to provide a "thick description" of this school district in keeping with principles of qualitative research.

The context of the school district is outlined first. It includes aspects of the "external" context, a description of the surrounding community and an "internal" context which

includes a description of the schools and personnel involved in the study.

The next section builds a description of the teacher evaluation program from a temporal point of view (past and present) and also from a group perspective (teachers, school based administrator, central office administrators, and the superintendent). The description is guided by the questions outlined in Appendix 7, looking at historical factors (antecedents), development and implementation, present policies and situation, and the strenghts and weaknesses of the teacher evaluation program.

The strengths and weaknesses were handled in a manner similar to the analysis of question 1 of the superintendent's questionnaire in phase 1. Each strength and weakness was paraphrased and classified. The categories developed as each strength and weakness was placed on a 5x7 card. As each comment was recorded on a card, it was also color coded to allow me to make references not only to the total group of interviewees but also to each of the four main stakeholder groups.

Each of these topics is described from the point of view of the four main stakeholders. It should be noted that the findings are reported as a composite picture of each group and for that reason the reader should interpret the findings with caution (Guba and Lincoln, 1982:379).

The analysis of the results found in Chapter 5 first compare those features that seem to make it successful, as

seen by the interviewees, with those features found in the review of the literature and the survey of the Alberta superintendents. Second, a comparison is made of what is "on paper" (policy documents) against what is apparently occurring (answers to the interview questions). Finally, an analysis of the implementation is made to draw out the reasons why the teacher evaluation program in the Red Deer Public School District is a success. Recommendations as to practice, theory, and research are presented in the final chapter.

Rigor

As Guba and Lincoln (1982:378) have stated, one can not consider validity and reliability of the total experiment, but must consider the elements of the experiment such as the instrumentation, data analysis, the relationship between conclusions and data, etc. The same is true of the case study method, one must consider the reliability and validity of the interviews, the analysis of the documents and the conclusions that are drawn from the data. "The case study is, in regard to demonstrating rigor, not a whit different from other technique".

The interview technique, the primary instrument for gathering the findings, is sometimes challenged as to its reliability or validity. However, if a number of precautions are taken, these doubts can be reduced. First,

by utilizing systematic thinking, a concrete plan of action can be developed (ie. example of questions to be asked in the interview, schedules, analytical procedures, etc.) such that subsequent researchers could replicate your procedures. "A structured format ... minimizes the intrusion of values and enhances a study's replicability." (Foster and Nixon,1976:20)

The fact that I spent considerable time in the field collecting information and interacting with the respondents would increase the validity of the results, particularly in comparison to a questionnaire filled out and mailed to a distant respondent. As Cohen and Manion (1980:252) outline:

> The main purpose of using an interview in research is that it is believed that in an interpersonal encounter people are more likely to disclose aspects of themselves, their thoughts, their feelings and values, than they would in a less human situation.

It is felt that the human element of the interview, discussion, helps to make the respondent more comfortable and thus more willing to provide reliable information and thus increase validity.

> The more the interviews becomes rational, calculating, and detached, the less likely the interview is to be perceived as a friendly transaction, and the more calculated the response also is likely to be.

As well, I recognize that when dealing with humans, bias cannot be eliminated. Bias is found in both the researcher and the respondent. However, the researcher can limit the bias by recognizing that it exists and by making a conscious effort to make allowances. As stated by Bogdan

and Biklen (1982:43) "qualitative researchers try to acknowledge and take into account their own biases as a method of dealing with them."

The primary goal was not to pass judgment but to add to existing knowledge.

> Stating that case studies lack validity is an oversimplification. No study has inherent validity. We must ask "valid for what?" A given case study might be highly valid for some purposes and totally invalid for others. Triangulation, a process of seeking confirmatory data from a variety of sources, can often be used to increase validity.(Jaeger,1980:8)

I used triangulation as a method of trying to increase validity and reliability. In an article by Jick (1979:603), he describes two types of triangulation, "within" and "between". He states:

> In short, "within-method" triangulation essentially involves cross-checking for internal consistency or reliability while "between-method" triangulation tests the degree of external validity.

In this study, "within" triangulation was mainly accomplished by a comparison of the different stakeholder groups' description of the teacher evaluation program. Also, as Jick (1979:605) outlines, the collection of documents and observations by the researcher helped provide additional internal checks.

The "between" triangulation was accomplished by comparing the interview results with the descriptions of the questionnaire results and three other independent reports completed on the teacher evaluation program on this school district (Lyons,1985, Jesse,1985, and Cooper,1986). These

multi-methods or combined levels of triangulation as described by Cohen and Manion (1980:214-215) are appropriate when the study being completed is designed to provide an "holistic view of educational outcomes", to describe "a complex phenomenon", and to indicate that a "controversial aspect of education is being studied."

The use of triangulation not only helps increase reliability and validity but has a number of other side-effects. As Jick (1979:608-609) indicates it gives the researcher more confidence in the results, it can stimulate inventive methods, it can help uncover deviant phenomena, synthesize theories, and is a crucial test of theories. It can provide "the glue that cements the interpretation of multi-method results." (Jick,1979:609)

Generalizability

All individuals are unique, as are all school districts. However, notwithstanding differences, common elements can be seen when comparisons are made with others. This study was not comparative but offers the opportunity for the reader to make comparisons. The use of a case study relies on "naturalistic generalization", which is to say that the researcher lets the data speak for themselves. Cohen and Manion state (1980:99):

> The purpose of such observations is to probe deeply and to analyse intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle of the unit with a view

> to establishing generalizations about the wider population to which that unit belongs.

The school jurisdiction studied is both typical and atypical. That is to say it has aspects in common with other school jurisdictions in Alberta; but because of its cultural, organizational, and human context is very different from all others. It is felt that people gain their knowledge and understanding through experience in individual life events. The findings in this case study will add to readers' experience and thus to their knowledge. It is also expected that readers of this report will exercise judgement in making use of the findings by extracting the information that is meaningful to them. As stated in Jaeger (1980:7);

> The case study researcher does not guarantee that the reader will have an equal share in the interpretation, but it is common for responsibility to be shared between the case study researcher and reader.

Ethical Considerations

The ethical concerns related to this study have been considered in light of the Department of Educational Administration's Research Ethics Review Policies and Procedures (July,1985).

The two main ethical considerations in dealing with the questionnaire were to reduce any disruption in the superintendent's busy schedule by keeping the survey as brief as possible and by maintaining the respondent's

anonymity by removing personal identification from the returned surveys and reporting the data as a composite group in a summary format.

In the case study, since the design included entry into and description of a field situation, a concerted effort was made to disrupt the participants as little as possible from their regular routines. My guiding principle was to conduct the data collection and reporting in such a way that after completion of the research the participants would be receptive to being involved in a similar research experience in the future.

As outlined in Bogdan and Biklen (1982:50), "treat your subjects with respect and seek their cooperation in the research". This principle was paramount in the researcher's mind. All participants were fully informed of the purpose of the study and voluntary consent was solicited from each participant. They were also given the the option to withdraw from the study at any point. All information gained from the interviews was treated confidentially. Participants were guaranteed anonymity in reporting of the results through the use of descriptive accounts of the data and partial verbatim examples. Results are reported as a composite group, not as individuals. The superintendent was an exception. As he was a group in himself, his comments cannot be kept anonymous. However, he was provided a copy of the descriptive portion of the findings of the interviews and allowed to make ammendments and verify his comments.

In addition, a random sample of participants was asked to review portions of the report to ensure accuracy before publication. A covering letter (Appendix 8), along with a copy of the descriptive portion of Chapter 4 was sent by mail to twelve interviewees. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was also enclosed. Of the twelve reports sent out, six were returned with comments.

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings

The findings are presented in two sections which correspond to the two phases of the research, the questionnaire survey and the case study. The questionnaire findings are first reported in general forms; then individual issues of interest are presented. The presentation tends to follow the question format of the survey instrument.

Phase Two, the case study, is reported by outlining the context of the school board and its personnel, the historical background, the development and implementation process, the policies, the present situation, and finally the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher evaluation program. These descriptions are based on the interview transcripts and are supported by other documentary data collected.

Questionnaire Findings

As stated in Chapter Three, 81 usable responses resulted from a sample of 116 questionnaires mailed to all superintendents in Alberta in February and March of 1986.

Question One: What do you consider the hallmarks of an effective teacher supervision program? List the criteria below.

Question one was answered in 73 questionnaires. A total of 307 individual criteria were identified by the respondents. Five respondents, who did not answer this question, instead enclosed a copy of their jurisdiction's policy statement on teacher evaluation.

From these responses, eleven clusters emerged. The majority of the responses 62% fell into a category in which six factors were consistently advocated. The remaining responses 38% fell into a category in which five factors received varing amounts of support. The responses in this category were highly varied and at times contradictory.

Consistent responses. The first major category of factors seemed to be those for which there were no opposing or negative comments. That is to say there were no opposite or debatable criteria. The factors in this sub-set are:

1) knowledge or understanding of policies and procedures,
2) feedback or follow-up,
3) training and top-level support,
4) cooperation and teacher in-put,
5) evaluation based on research and a model of teaching, and
6) a development of trust using a process of appeal,

sufficient time to develop evaluation procedures, consistent evaluations, and positive overtones.

Table 4.1 summarizes the responses in relation to the six factors that emerged and will be followed by a discussion of each of these factors.

Table 4.1

Number of Responses for the Consistent Category

Factors		Number of responses
1. Knowledge / Understanding (includes having policies for teacher evaluation in place)		45
2. Feedback / Follow-Up / Conferences		29
3. In-service and training for both teachers and evaluators (includes all support provided by central office)		29
4. Cooperation / Teacher Input		20
5. Program based on research or a model of teaching.		19
6. Trust and factors that develop it.		
a) Trust	11	
b) Appeal process for teachers	8	
c) Time to develop program	4	
d) Consistent evaluations	11	
e) Positive overtones on reports	14	
		48
TOTAL (62%)		190

The first factor was the need for *knowledge and understanding* of the teacher evaluation program. This requirement extended to both the teachers being evaluated and the administrators completing the evaluation. There were indications of a clear belief that the school board should lay out the teacher evaluation program in the form of policies, guidelines and procedures; and that these should be communicated to the teachers. These policies should be easily accessible to both teachers and evaluators. In fact 40% of the responses related to this factor specifically stated board policy is needed to make the teacher evaluation program effective.

The following statements by superintendents are illustrative:

"Teachers and evaluators must have good knowledge of guidelines and procedures to be used."

"The system has established expectations and ... these are communicated to participants."

(See Appendix 9 for further examples of responses.)

The second major factor identified the need for *feedback* to the teachers after evaluation. This category includes such ideas as conferences before and immediately after observation, and follow-up procedures after an evaluation has been written. Respondents also indicated that just providing a report to the teacher being evaluated was not sufficent; that two way communication was important. This includes the need for the evaluator to provide

suggestions or alternatives if performance was inadequate.

Thus, after any evaluation it is not just the feedback which is important but an ongoing need to follow-up on any recommendations for improvement at a later time. The need for a supportive, collegial system with an educational team approach was seen to be important not only in this factor but in other factors.

The following are some of the comments made by superintendents on the need for *feedback and follow-up*:

"[Evaluators] should follow-up observations to determine whether suggestions have been effectively implemented."

"[Evaluators should] provide opportunities for communication and exchange between the evaluator and teacher."

(See Appendix 10 for further examples of responses.)

The third factor was the *need for support* by the board for the teacher evaluation program. In particular, the respondents identified the need for training in teaching and evaluation techniques. Trained evaluators seemed to be considered an important aspect of an effective teacher evaluation program. Also suggested was the need for support in the form of time, money, and personnel. Thus support of a teacher evaluation program must come from the board in the form of both budgetary and moral support.

The following comments indicate these types of concerns and are representative:

An effective teacher evaluation program "... incorporates an effective teaching program on a volunteer basis and ... also includes a program to train supervisors of instruction -- in-school and system administrators to conduct both formative and summative evaluation."

"... the system has a coordinated plan for in-service and training of participants (eg. administrators, coordinators, teacher). Participants should take responsibility for the program."

(See Appendix 11 for further examples of responses.)

The fourth factor was the need for *cooperation and teacher input*. This did not necessarily mean that teachers had to have total control of the development of the evaluation program but, as many respondents stated, there needs to be input from teachers and administrators as the program developed. The following are some specific statements expressing this thought:

"Persons being evaluated and those doing the evaluation were involved in the development of the system."

"Teachers and evaluators must mutually agree on goals and objectives which are to be accomplished, based on information gained in the supervising program."

(See Appendix 12 for further examples of responses.)

The fifth factor was that teacher evaluation should be *based on research* or some agreed on model of teaching. The exact model is not as important as the fact that the staff of a school jurisdiction should choose a particular

model which they have researched and feel is appropriate to their situation. The criteria for effective teaching that are associated with the chosen model must also be easily observable and understood by both the teacher and evaluator.

The following are some of the comments made by superintendents:

"The 'effective' characteristics need to be identified and based on current research if it is to be valid."

"Evaluation criteria are directly related to the responsibilities of the person being evaluated, such criteria to include observable job behaviors and be flexible enough to take individual difference into account."

(See Appendix 13 for further examples of responses.)

The sixth and final factor underscores a cluster of observations that varied in phrasing but all pointed to trust as an essential part of a successful teacher evaluation program. In many cases the terms "fairness" and "equitable" were used in place of trust. The following were frequently emphasised as important correlates of trust: the need for an appeal process, time for teachers to bring necessary changes into their teaching, and the need for consistent and positive reports. All of these were seen to contribute to an atmosphere or climate of trust and respect.

The following are representative of statements that pointed to the importance of trust. Teacher evaluation needs to:

"...be based on mutual trust, respect and responsibility."

"...have an underlying philosophy which regards the worth and dignity of the individual as paramount,"

"...be predicated on a positive, supportive rather than a negative 'watchdog' thrust,"

"...aid the teacher in identifying and capitalizing on strengths."

(See Appendix 14 for further examples of responses.)

Diverse responses. The second major category of responses identified factors for which superintendents submitted conflicting views or at least not total consensus. These responses seem to correspond to the following five issues; the purposes for teacher evaluation (Why evaluate teachers?), the focus of the program (What teaching characteristics are to be evaluated?), the methods to be used in the evaluations (How will teachers be evaluated?), the agents (Who will evaluate teachers?), and the schedule for evaluation (When will teachers be evaluated?). Table 4.2 summarizes the responses to these five issues.

The closest to a consensus occurred in the responses for the first issue, the purpose or "Why evaluate teachers?". Of the 43 responses 70% felt evaluation should be carried out for 'formative' reasons, 19% felt it should be for 'summative' reasons and 11% felt it should be for both.

The following comments illustrate the range of opinion:

"A dedicated staff of supervisors whose first concern is growth and remediation rather than termination."

"Provides employees with formative information that they can use to improve instruction."

"The emphasis should be on improving teacher effectiveness involving day to day contact/consultation with colleagues."

Table 4.2

Number of Responses for the Diverse Category

Issues	Number of responses
1. Purpose (Why evaluate teachers?)	43
2. Focus (What characteristics are to be evaluated?)	18
3. Methods (How will teachers be evaluated?)	11
4. Agents (Who will evaluate teachers?)	20
5. Schedules (When will evaluate teachers?)	25
Total (38%)	117

"One which emphasizes formative evaluation but does not hesitate to conduct summative evaluations for beginning and tenured teachers."

"The purpose of the policy should be to facilitate; a)instructional improvement, b) teacher recognition and support, c) decision making."

"Allow for the taking of appropriate action with respect to those teachers whose performance is unacceptable."

The large majority, 30 of the 43 (70%), of the responses from superintendents indicated that formative evaluation is an important hallmark of an effective teacher evaluation program.

This is interesting in light of the Alberta Education mandate to evaluate for both purposes. It is indicated in the provincial policy (Appendix 1, para.6) that evaluation should be used to help teachers develop and improve teaching but, as a school division and thus a superintendent is held accountable for complete evaluation of all teachers, this tends to make evaluation summative: moreover the report must be on file. Notwithstanding, it seems that superintendents still view teacher evaluation as important for improving and developing teachers (formative) not just as an administrative tool for making decisions or fulfilling a provincial policy, mainly summative.

The second issue, *the focus* of teacher evaluation or "What characteristics of teaching will be evaluated?",

elicited many different ideas including references to / suggestions for methods of teaching, student results or standards of achievement or outcomes, classroom behaviors and attitudes, preparation, teaching methodology, classroom climate, and coverage of curriculum. Some felt a number of aspects of the teacher's performance should be considered. The following are some of the most significant comments and again indicate the range of opinion:

"Oriented toward classroom behaviors."

"Require a review of the teacher's total instructional practices including both preparatory work as well as teaching methodology."

"Ensure that teachers teach what is prescribed."

"Related to standards of student achievement."

"Should concentrate on establishing effective classroom climate."

The third issue, *methods* of evaluation or "How will teachers be evaluated?", again resulted in no clear consensus. Superintendents felt methods should consist of numerous visits and sources with direct classroom observation as the most important. The recording of observations should also be detailed to help in the evaluation. Some of the most noteworthy comments are:

"Evaluation based on numerous sources of data (interviews, documents, visits)."

"Classroom visitation and discussion."

"Direct observation of classroom performance and

feedback."

"Evaluation instruments should require the supervisor to make written entries about the observations (as opposed to a check list)."

"Minimize disruptions - the evaluation process should disrupt the teaching / learning process as little as possible."

The fourth issue, *the agents* of evaluation or "Who will evaluate teachers?" produced probably the most diversity in opinions. The principal or immediate supervisor was the one considered most. However, some felt evaluation should be a peer evaluation, a self-evaluation, a multi-agent evaluation and even an evaluation by both the principal and central office personnel. The following are some of the diverse responses:

"Direct supervision by school based administrator involving 'immediate' supervisor (ie. principal)."

"Principals must be involved since they are in the best position to keep on a day to day basis."

"The principal is a very key person in the evaluation process."

"Peer/collegial supervision."

"Procedures provide for multiple evaluations and provide opportunity for self-evaluation."

"Peer evaluation and self-evaluation should be encouraged and could form part of the formal evaluation report."

"Peers are involved in the program opportunities for peer supervision, coaching, inter-classroom visits."

"One that makes provision for self-evaluation and peer evaluation but does not include superintendent evaluation."

The final issue of the diverse category, *the schedule of* evaluations or "When will teachers be evaluated?", again produced mixed results. The response which did occur frequently was that evaluation should be "regular" and "continuous" or "on-going". There were some who felt that teachers at different stages of their career should be evaluated on a different schedule while some felt a need for growth plans, for development. The following are indicative of the comments made:

"More frequent for beginning teachers and teachers new to a jurisdiction than for other teachers (but at least a visit to every teacher and a formal report at least once every three years)."

"Early supervision by principal-superintendent in career of teacher."

"One which provides regular and numerous formative evaluation cycles for all teachers."

"Regularity of supervision (continuous)."

"Continuous and on-going for all teachers."

"Regular evaluation every 3-4 years."

"Provides for supervision in several differing situations over a reasonable period of time."

"On-going and developmental in nature."

Significance. As a means of comparing the responses to the question, What are the criteria of an effective teacher evaluation program?, submitted by the superintendents of Alberta to the criteria of an effective teacher evaluation program discovered in the literature search, Table 4.3 below has been developed to help organize this information in a visual format. The criteria that emerged from the analysis of the questionnaires are divided into two categories, consistent and diverse responses, and are listed down the left side of the page. The major research reports found in the literature search are listed along the top of the page. The four research reports are the RAND study (Wise et al, 1985), T. McGreal's book (1983), D. Townsend's report (1984) and the Advisory Committee's report(1986). Also included in the Table is the provincial policy for teacher evaluation as outlined in the Program Policy Manual (1985), Appendix 1. This policy was included for reference and as a check-list or report card of how superintendents compare to provincial policy. (Summaries of these reports are found in Chapter 2, Review of the Literature.)

The six factors that comprise Category A are significant. They summarize the factors that superintendents in Alberta seem to feel are essential features, for the development of an effective teacher evaluation program.

Table 4.3

Hallmarks of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program

Factors identified by Alberta Superintendents	Major Studies from Literature Search				
	1.Rand	2.McGreal	3.Townsend	4.Advisory Committee	5.Program Policy Manual
Category A. Consistent					
1. Knowledge	x	x	x	x	x
2. Feedback					x
3. Training	x	x	x	x	
4. Cooperation	x		x	x	x
5. Research		x	x	x	
6.Trust		x	x	x	x
Category B Diverse					
1. Purpose (Why?)		x		x	x
2. Focus (What?)		x			
3. Agents (Who?)					
4. Schedule (When?)					
5. Method (How?)					

Note: x denotes acknowledgement of the factor by a research report.

For two of them there was a total agreement. The first, the need for all involved personnel to have a knowledge and understanding of the evaluation processes and procedures. The respondents indicated that it was preferable to have these outlined in policy statements. The second factor with consensus was the need for training and top-level support. This training is not just for evaluators but for teachers as well. This would include methodology of evaluation for evaluators and in-service for teachers on the model of teaching or characteristics that will be used to guide the evaluator.

Three of the features identified in the questionnaires were found in three of the four reports that were reviewed. The need for cooperation and teacher in-put was seen as important by the RAND report, Townsend, and the Advisory Committee. The need for the teacher evaluation program to be based on research and a model of teaching was identified by McGreal, Townsend and the Advisory Committee. The trust criterion was identified by McGreal, Townsend and the Advisory Committee.

Interestingly enough, the only factor for which there was no consensus among the respondents -- feedback-- did not seem to be considered as important in any of the four reports. This may be the result of feedback being included as part of good training of evaluators or as part of the teacher in-put criterion. It is also possible that superintendents, who are the main persons involved in

translating research into practice, see the importance of using the results of an evaluation for some other purpose besides just fulfilling the provincial mandate to evaluate.

It could also be the fact that superintendents in the process of setting up their teacher evaluation programs (as mandated by the province) have tried to improve on areas that were deficient, that is, eliminating evaluation for evaluation's sake, with not much feedback, follow-up or actual use of the reports that were generated after an observation. This seems to be an area that the research reviewed in the literature did not consider as an important criterion (hallmark) for an effective teacher evaluation program.

Using the last column, the Program Policy Manual, as a checklist, it would seem that the superintendents were compling with Alberta Education's mandated policy on teacher evaluation, as four of the superintendents' criteria are directly applicable to the Program Policy Manual. It is possible that the superintendents' responses to the questionnaire were, in fact, affected by the Alberta Education policy.

In conclusion, it seems that all six factors from the consistent category are essential for the development of an atmosphere of trust. If all these factors were present in a teacher evaluation program, then trust would develop between evaluators and teachers. This atmosphere might then benefit all stakeholders in the education system, from the

superintendent to the teacher, and teaching would tend to improve with the end result being beneficial to the most important stakeholder, the student.

The answers to the issues or questions in the diverse category are of course important, but as the research indicates, it is more important to ensure that these questions are answered in a way that is compatible with local conditions and purposes and not that any particular model is chosen. (McGreal, 1982:8-35; Townsend, 1984:48-51). Wise et al (1985:103) summarize this concept as follows "educational policies and procedures must be tailored to local circumstances ... modified on the basis of local experience."

Question 2: Nominate one school jurisdiction in Alberta (other than your own) which you feel is characterized by your above criteria.

Not all returned questionnaires provided a nomination. Eleven respondents stated that they did not have enough knowledge, ten did not answer the question, seven wrote that they didn't know any, five filled in a "?", four felt none existed. One superintendent nominated his district and three nominated two or more school jurisdictions.

In all, the respondents provided a total of 47 nominations. One school jurisdiction was clearly first -- Red Deer School District #104 received 11 nominations (23%). The next closest school jurisdictions were Edmonton Public and Separate School Districts, with 5 nominations each (11%)

and the fourth, Rocky View School Division #41, having three(6%). The remaining votes were divided between 17 school jurisdictions. Refer to Appendix 15, for the complete list of results.

The fact that approximately half of the respondents did not answer this question could indicate that superintendents did not understand the question or did not have time to answer or could not choose between many equal choices. I believe that many did not make a nomination because they had limited knowledge of teacher evaluation programs in other jurisdictions. This limited knowledge is the result of a combination of geographic dispersion, the limited time that superintendents have to devote to teacher evaluation and thus delegation of teacher evaluation to other personnel, and the fact that the provincial policy that mandated teacher evaluation was less that a year old at the time the questionnaire was sent out.

Question 3: How would you rate your jurisdiction's teacher supervision program in comparison to the above nomination?

Again not all respondents answered this question. Twelve did not answer and three rated themselves in two or more of the categories: thus there were 66 useable answers. The great majority, 42%, rated themselves as equally effective as the nominated school jurisdiction in question two. The remaining responses are as follows: 29% indicated they were "still developing", 14% rated themselves as "less effective", 9% "more effective", and 6% "much more

effective". Although not requested, a number of comments were included in responses to this question. The vast majority of the comments stated that the school district was still developing its teacher evaluation program. This comment serves as a good example:

"As a result of implementing criteria, we are much more effective; however we are still developing and will get better."

These results seem reasonable, taking into account that Alberta Education's new policy for teacher evaluation was in its first year of development and thus most school jurisdictions would have been developing and experimenting with newly implemented programs.

Question 4: If you have any additional comments regarding this survey, please indicate them below.

Seventeen of the respondents (21%) wrote comments. Of this number, five provided the researcher with a contact person or jurisdictions where information might be sought. The following are the comments that were enlightening or informative and gave further insight into how superintendents see teacher evaluation:

"Some supervision (ie. evaluation) policies are the 'Dance of the Whooping Crane' ie. lots of noise and feathers but signifying nothing (sex but no egg!!).

(Commenting on the use of the principal as a summative evaluator.) "Associations have policies opposing this. I think they do teachers a disservice because principals are

more intimately aware of what happens in a classroom day by day."

"The effectiveness of a particular supervision program I think you will find will: a) be defended by the proponent, and b) be re-evaluated at frequent intervals as mine is since I have worked principally in this area for over eight years."

"I see the supervision program as a 'helping program' - not evaluative."

The fact that only 21% of the respondents made additional comments and 63% wanted a summary of this research project, indicates there is considerable interest in teacher evaluation. However, interest is limited and certainly not universal. It seems natural that in the first years of implementing a provincial policy, particularly one of such importance and magnitude, there should be considerable concern and interest.

Part 5: Optional: If you would like to receive a copy of a summary of my research report, please record your return address below.

Superintendents were given the option of obtaining a copy of a summary report of the thesis and were requested to write their address in the space provided if they wanted to receive a copy. Fifty-one of the respondents (63%) asked for a copy. The reciprocal of course, is that 37% of superintendents chose not to partake!

Phase Two - Case Study

The following segment of the chapter is a "thick" description of the Red Deer District teacher evaluation program. First the cultural and organizational context of the program will be described. Then the group of educators who were interviewed will be described. Next, the development of the present teacher evaluation program will be outlined and the operation of the present program will be described in greater detail. Included in this description are the present policies related to teacher evaluation. Finally the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher evaluation program will be discussed.

Information about the Red Deer City area was taken from The Future is Now, a document that is used to promote the economic development of the city. The information concerning the school district was taken from the latest Red Deer Public School District Annual Report and information for each of the individual schools was taken from school produced handbooks.

Context

External. The city of Red Deer is one of the fastest growing cities in the province of Alberta. Red Deer is located in Central Alberta, midway between the two large urban centers of Calgary and Edmonton. It has an urban population of 52,620 (based on the 1985 census) and a trade

area population of 200,000 people. Its regional economic base includes agriculture, fossil fuels, and manufacturing. As stated in the summary of data in Red Deer - Central Alberta - The Future is Now, published by the Economic Development Department (page 9), 1985:

> The beautiful parkland centre of Red Deer provides a small town atmosphere with big city amenities. An expanded economic base and growing employment opportunities, extensive cultural and recreational opportunities, superior transportation links and top grade municipal services characterize the dynamic City of Red Deer.

In driving around Red Deer to visit the schools were I conducted the interviews, in camping and shopping in the malls and downtown, I would have to agree with the above description. It is a beautiful city nestled in the Red Deer River Valley. It seemed like your average small urban center with a wide range of cultural and religious backgrounds. The socio-economic level seemed a little above average as few slum areas were visible, although this is to be expected as Red Deer is not much older than 100 years. Also, the statistics indicate an above average income level. The students of this school district would be classified as urban, as the outlying population is serviced by rural school jurisdictions.

Red Deer Public School District Number 104 is located in the City of Red Deer. It is relatively large in comparison to most rural school jurisdictions but small in comparison to the large urban school districts, both Protestant and Separate, in Calgary and Edmonton. It is the

ninth largest school jurisdiction in Alberta and the 5th largest of the urban districts.

Red Deer Public School District #104 is a Protestant Public School District with 21 schools, 434 teachers and 7,491 students. Also found in the city of Red Deer is the Roman Catholic Separate School system with 7 schools, 110 teachers and 1,800 students. There are four private schools and one post-secondary institution, Red Deer College, located in the city.

Internal. The Red Deer Public School District's breakdown of schools, students and teachers as of April 30, 1986, is indicated in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Red Deer Public School System

E.C.S. : Regular students		336
French Immersion		59
Elementary (16 schools)		3837
Junior Secondary (5 schools)		1718
Senior Secondary (1 school)		1541
	Total	7491
Teachers (full time equivalent)		434

The organizational framework of the Red Deer Public School District is as follows. It is governed by a Board of Trustees made up of seven elected trustees. The administrational staff, located at a central office in the central part of the city, is lead by a superintendent of schools, a deputy and two assistant superintendents, all hired by the board. Also located in the central office are eight coordinators who have been assigned specific curriculum areas as their main focus.

Six schools were visited. The large high school consisted of 1541 students from grade 10 to 12, a principal and three vice principals (each assigned one of the three grade levels), a business manager, four counsellors, ten department heads and 93 teachers. Two junior high schools were visited. One consisted of 289 students from grade 7 to 9, one principal, vice principal and counsellor, and 17 teachers; the other junior secondary school consisted of 373 students from grade 7 to 9, a principal, two vice principals, a counsellor, and 18 teachers. Three elementary schools were visited. One consisted of 46 students K to 4, a principal/teacher and 2 full-time and 2 part-time teachers; the second had 289 students K to 6, a principal, a vice principal, a counsellor, and 14 teachers; the third consisted of 179 students K to 6, a principal, a vice-principal, a counsellor, and 15 teachers.

Thirty four educators were interviewed. They were distributed widely among grade levels and positions in the

organization. The table that follows summarizes the break down of the interviewees:

Table 4.5

Distribution of Personnel Interviewed

	Total	Elementary	Junior Secondary	Senior Secondary
Teachers	13	4	6	3
In-School Administrators	10	3	5	2
- principals	5			
- vice-principals	5			
Coordinators	8			
Central Office Administrators	3			
Total	34			

The background of personnel interviewed was varied and experience extensive. The superintendent had spent 26 years in education and after 21 years of experience as a teacher and administrator, mostly in a large urban setting, had spent the last four years as the Superintendent of Schools in Red Deer. The other members of the central office staff -- which included the Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, and Coordinators -- varied in experience in education from 40 years to 17 years with an average of 25 years. Their time spent in the Red Deer District varied from 24 years to 1 year with an average of 14 years and the range of time spent working out of central office varied from 20 years to one year with an average of 10 years. It should be noted that the present position of coordinator had at one time been a consultant position. Many of the present coordinators had been consultants in the past or had changed subject areas or responsibilities.

Of the in-school administrators interviewed, five were principals and five were vice-principals. Their educational background ranged from 30 years to 7 years with an average of 17 years. They had from 21 to 5 years working in the Red Deer District with a mean of 13 years and a range of 20 years to one year as administrators and a mean of seven years in that role.

Teachers who were interviewed came from all three levels of schools, elementary, junior secondary, and senior secondary with a wide range of subjects. The range of

teacher experience was from one year to 27 years with the average of 12 years. The time spent in the Red Deer District was the same range as above and the average was 7 years.

Historical Background / Context

The historical background of teacher evaluation in the Red Deer Public School District prior to implementation of the present teacher evaluation policies and programs can be divided into two periods, the early (pre-Hunterism) period and the Madeline Hunter Period.

The early period in Red Deer, prior to 1979, as in most school boards in Alberta, was a time when teacher evaluation had a low priority.

As one teacher stated:

"It was mostly limited to new teachers trying to get their permanent certificate. I had never been evaluated in my 20 years here until this spring ".

Or as a coordinator stated:

"There was probably very little teacher evaluation done other than what was done by the superintendent or his direct advocate."

As for in-school administrators, one principal described the situation this way:

"There was no direct responsibility for administrators to evaluate or supervise teachers and there was certainly no

structured policy, regulation or anything that we operated under."

The only other reasons that might have prompted teacher evaluation, as indicated by the interviewees, were concerns expressed by parents, a principal's concern or "if they heard something", but basically it was a "hit and miss affair", "haphazard".

In describing the evaluations that did occur, one administrator stated,

"Certainly there wasn't a uniform method or at least a common way of doing it as I think we have now. Each principal was basically on his own to evaluate."

One vice principal stated, "We [vice principals] were sure not involved in teacher evaluation before the present policy." A coordinator was not quite as kind about past evaluation methods, he stated:

> I think it was more what maybe we would call a glad handshake type of supervision, where you walk in, you sit and you look and you're not sure what you're looking for, but you get a nice feeling and you say good job Joe and away you go.

There was no specific focus, there were no evaluation instruments or teaching model, and as another coordinator put it, "You didn't have the skills to know what you were looking for, and if you saw them, you wouldn't know how to improve on them."

As for the coordinators at central office (called consultants at that time) they were involved in program evaluation but not teacher evaluation. The only exception

would be if a coordinator had expertise in a particular area, for example French. There were fewer coordinators then.

About 1979 a group of administrators (both at central office and in schools) became aware of the Madeline Hunter approach. This group of administrators had been investigating the literature and had formed a committee to go over instruments and check-lists, and listen to speakers. The committee members were impressed with Madeline Hunter's model of coaching. In fact as one coordinator put it;

> There was a 2 or 3 year period [when] all of our principals were actively involved in Hunterism and we were probably one of the first school districts in the province to really, you know, do that. We're talking seven years ago.

In the few years leading up to the development of the present policy a number of administrators were sent to California to take the course from Madeline Hunter, while others were sent to presentations that she made in Canada. Returning administrators gave extensive in-service to other administrators and teachers in the district. The results of this interest and activity with the Hunter model led to "dramatic changes in terms of things such as lesson design, motivational techniques, reinforcement, modelling..." and "we had a lot of principals in classrooms over that period of time and very few formal evaluations in that way."

These activities, concerned with teacher supervision using a specific model, would form the base for future development of teacher evaluation. As one administrator

explained, the resulting visiting of classrooms by administrators to assist in the Hunter model, probably produced less anxiety and more trust when the new teacher evaluation programs were initiated.

The consensus amoung respondents was that a new period of intensive teacher evaluation (as well as school, program, and student evaluation) began with the appointment of a new superintendent, Ken Jesse. Ken described the few years prior to his arrival as follows:

> Essentially it was a developmental process -- with the emphasis being on instructional strategies, lesson design, staff development -- and there was no firm policy in place. Practice was based upon the Madeline Hunter model, and there had been extensive in-service using that model. It was a good model and the in-servicing had made significant differences in how principals were supervising their teachers.

Ken felt that the situation that presented itself when he arrived was far from a problem. He brought with him eight years of experience in developing and implementing teacher and administrator evaluation in Calgary. Ken continued:

> They had done a lot of initial work on it. It was a very fertile seed bed. And the work they had done was just excellent. It was a good group of principals and the supervision process was well established.

Development and Implementation of the Current Policy

When describing historical events, it is not always easy or convenient to divide them into periods of time. However, in the opinion of the vast majority of personnel

interviewed, the arrival of Ken Jesse gave critical impetus to the development and implementation of the present evaluation policies. This section will review the rationale for the development of the policies, the role of the stakeholders, the in-services that were conducted, and finally the problems that were encountered and how they were dealt with during this period of development and implementation.

Rationale. As stated before, most interviewees saw Ken Jesse as the major innovator. As one administrator stated;

> The new policy definitely started with Mr. Jesse getting the superintendency, because he came with a number of ideas and we had the teaching model in effect. He came with the idea of doing these various evaluations, which brought a formalization of things, like the number of visits that are required and the filing of reports, things like this.

However, many stated that the North American trend for accountability in teacher performance was another important factor, and some mentioned the "Keegstra Affair" as influential in the overall rationale for the teacher evaluation programs.

It is interesting that Red Deer District had already developed and implemented teacher evaluation policies and were ahead of the provincial mandate (MFP, Appendix 1) that instructed school jurisdictions to develop and implement teacher evaluation programs. Thus many interviewees speculated that Mr. Jesse had anticipated these governmental

moves toward mandating teacher evaluation. As one coordinator stated:

> Ken is very progressive and follows the literature very much. He knew very much the trends. I think Ken was able to anticipate the trend and in essence stay one jump ahead of what was going on.

A few felt that as Ken moved from a large urban district, were he was assistant superintendent and did not have total control over all aspects of evaluation in the school jurisdiction, to a smaller district, it allowed him to include all programs and aspects of a school jurisdiction into one philosophy of evaluation. Whatever the case, the development and implementation of these evaluation programs were timely.

Ken outlined his own rationale as follows. First the evaluation of teachers must be done in the context of the whole school and second the goals and objectives must be clear to everyone. As Ken explained, teacher evaluation should not occur in isolation and although attempts had been made to develop an integrated approach to teacher evaluation, the focus had been on the principal looking at the teacher in relation to classroom activities only. Ken felt a really effective evaluation program takes the following into account: "the program that the teacher is expected to teach", "the milieu related to the students in that community", "the climate and structure of the school", "administration", "the school, and the teachers". "There is a kind of a ethos, it isn't just a teacher in a classroom".

Ken also indicated the need to include parents' and students' reactions, student achievement, program reviews, administrator evaluation in any evaluation of a school. All of these in fact have been incorporated into the school review model. Thus, teacher evaluation is not just an isolated event or process, but is on-going and is only part of a larger whole, the total school evaluation.

The second rationale outlined by Ken was the need to make the goals and objectives clear to all concerned and demonstrate to everyone your intention to acheive them. He explained,

> Most people [will be] motivated to achieve certain priorities, goals and objectives, if they clearly understand what they are and if they know there's support to achieve them ... Then most programs have a good chance of success.

Role of stakeholders. The role of different stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation was varied in both intensity and involvement. As one administrator stated about his role in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation:

> [Our role] was direct in the sense that we had some input into it, but as far as it being a democratic process - it wasn't .... We had input, but the final decision was up to the central office administration and the school board.

The development and implementation of the Red Deer Public School District Teacher Evaluation Program (both in-school and school review) began as follows, according to the superintendent:

> The first thing we did was spend some time as a group of central office people reviewing lessons, talking about reporting, talking about evaluation, talking about supervision, going through some development things as a team of evaluators.

He continues to explain that there was no policy in place at that time, just models and plans. The development committee went out to the in-school administrators and teachers for input and feedback. A number of schools were reviewed and teachers evaluated. Again, administrators and teachers were surveyed for reaction and then evaluation policies were rewritten and put into place. At this time the government came along saying that teacher evaluation must be done and we had 90% of the policies already in place.

The process of evaluating and amending the teacher evaluation program and policies continued with in-put from studies such as Alan Cooper's Ed.D. Dissertation, which was presented to the board in March of 1986. As the administrators stated, it was a process of "fine-tuning", "adjusting", "adapting". Ken Jesse put it this way,

> ... the thrust that's been throughout is to learn, to try, to improve, to modify and to keep the targets clearly in front of us as to what we are going to do.

Most teachers interviewed felt that their role in the development was limited to the comments given at staff meetings and presented to central office in the form of group input. There was also input from the teachers' association local, but again this was not input from individual teachers. In the program evaluation, in the course of which teachers are also evaluated, their influence

was greater. They were consulted before the evaluation but "we didn't have influence on the formats that they used."

As one administrator described his role:

> It was more of a learner rather than an actual creator of policy .... A lot of the policy that is created does at some point go to schools for some input, feedback. So in that sense, we have had opportunities. But that's primarily after the fact. In other words, the policy has been developed and our input is more the fine-tuning. Then its finalized from there.

As many of the administrators stated, they saw their input increase as the teacher evaluation program was being implemented and tested. At this point they provided feedback as members of the evaluating team or in regular principal meetings. As well, the in-school administrators who, make up the District Operational Committee (DOC), along with the central office coordinators and superintendents provided substantial input. DOC, is responsible for generating policies which are later brought to the board for approval. As one coordinator stated,

> We were involved from the very beginning in committee work. The main framework was drawn up by Ken, but we had a hand in a lot of it.

The process was one of learning and revising before developing a policy to put in place. The respondents seemed to agree that this process of continually re-evaluating the programs and learning from the previous experiences is key to the success of their teacher evaluation programs. This learning is accomplished through extensive in-service and the superintendent indicated the importance of in-service:

> You've got to keep all of the pieces being well serviced in terms of development if you're going to expect success. It's an on going thing, a lot of input.

In-service. All groups saw in-service as one of the strong features of the developmental and implementation process. There had been major in-services during the two years of Madeline Hunter Training. This included both teachers using the Hunter teaching model and administrators using the Hunter supervision model. As the new teacher evaluation program was being developed and implemented, extensive in-service was carried out with administrators who would be the evaluators. Teacher in-service seem to be limited to outlining, for them, what teaching criteria would be evaluated.

In-service for in-school administrators consisted of such activities as practicing "script-taping" using VCR programs of teachers teaching; reviewing case studies or "in-basket" studies and then discussing reactions, evaluations, procedures, and actions to be taken; going over policy and ensuring uniformity of action; and reviewing pertinent literature about teacher evaluation and supervision. These in-services were part of regular principals' or vice principals' meetings, and part of the yearly retreat for administrators, as well as in-service that administrators completed on their own.

The coordinators were also very positive about the

number of in-services. They, along with in-school administrators, completed training at their regular meetings. This included, as one coordinator stated, "what to watch for, how to observe it, how to write your reports, what things should go into reports, and the criteria for teacher evaluation". Other areas covered in the in-services were how to assess people, a review of different evaluation instruments, and what procedures to follow if an evaluator encounters a teacher experiencing difficulties.

Combined with this planned, direct in-service, each administrator is involved in school reviews, in which teacher evaluation is a component. Thus there is an opportunity for administrators to practice, discuss and refine their teacher evaluation skills. As stated by the superintendent:

> We essentially ran most of those in-services ourself, but everyone that's gone away, say to a major conference or seminar, every principal or vice principal, has come back and shared with us what they have learned. We've shared a lot of common literature that we think is worth reading and we've sent it to everyone in the district.

In-servicing has been extensive and the board has been very supportive with both moral and financial support.

Problems/solutions. Finally, the interviews addressed the difficulties or problems that were encountered during implementation and how these problems were handled. Teachers had a different view of problems than administrators, both in-school and central office.

Teachers, major concern during implementation of the evaluation program was fear, anxiety, and hesitation about evaluation. Some called it a nuisance, but all felt that these feelings were somewhat alleviated by the openness and effort to make all evaluations positive. They stated that the process of informing them about what the evaluation would be like and what would be evaluated went a long way to help them feel less anxious. But one teacher stated "They certainly have got the screws on all the time." Thus there were still some feelings of insecurity and fear.

In-school administrators and central office coordinators felt the major problems were those created by a change, an innovation. As one administrator stated:

> I would say the problem primarily came out of change, as it often does. It was a change for all people in the district, for the teachers to have people taking roles of supervision, evaluating and going into their classrooms, was a change. That was an unusual thing to be happening to them, to move from informal visits to final report writing of teachers. For some that was difficult to accept.

But these problems were dealt with in an ongoing process of being open and providing in-service. As a coordinator stated

> ... being open and involving people at all levels and giving them in-service, I think those are the three areas that we used to try to get around anything that's new.

Thus, the development of a feeling of trust helped ease the staff members into the change to formal teacher evaluation.

Another major problem that was mentioned was staff

training. Even though extensive in-service was provided, all administrators, including the superintendent, cited this as a concern. In fact, all felt that it was a concern that must be continually addressed. As the superintendent stated,

> There was a problem of training, and I think it still exists, because you could probably study [teacher evaluation] forever and never feel totally comfortable with it.

Along with training, there was the problem of the time. The superintendent stated that to overcome this problem, "the best, most effective way of implementing it was to schedule time more carefully." He went on to say that with the realignment of priorities and time-lines, the evaluations had been completed without additional cost or additional staff.

> The most encouraging thing [was that] the Board of Trustees, as well as the staff, but the Board of Trustees in particular, have been very supportive in terms of doing it.

Ken concluded by stating "Time is still a issue, always an issue."

The final concern expressed was the fear that the program would result in over-evaluation. Both in-school administrators and central office coordinators felt that there needed to be constant monitoring to ensure that over-evaluation does not occur.

Teacher Evaluation Policies

The developmental period resulted in the rewriting of

district policies. Following is an outline of the policies that are pertinent to teacher evaluation. Since teacher evaluation is also a component of the school review process, the latter will be explained also. Included in the pertinent policies are descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of all supervisors and evaluators, the policy for all supervision and evaluation, and the criteria for teacher evaluation that are specified in the school review policy. All pertinent policies concerning teacher evaluation are included in Appendix 16.

The policies for superintendents are 3005, "Superintendent of Schools", 3010 "Role of the Deputy Superintendent" and 3009 "Role of the Assistant Superintendent - Personnel and Administration". In 3005, the specific reference to teacher evaluation states that the superintendent is responsible for the "...evaluation of the staff and system". Both the role of the deputy and assistant superintendent, policies 3009 and 3010, show that their "duties and responsibilities include assisting with supervision and evaluation of teachers, administrators, and schools".

The role of a coordinator, as was indicated previously in the historical background, has undergone some changes, particularly in regard to the development of the teacher evaluation program. In fact, the superintendent indicated that the expertise of the coordinators was a key factor in the evaluation of teachers and the school review process.

Policy 7010, "The Role of the Coordinator" states that coordinators shall "assist in supervising and evaluating staff members". This is a radical departure from their previous role as consultants for programs and resource persons for teachers, not evaluators of performance.

The principal's role is outlined in policy 7020 and states, "in fulfilling this responsibility the principal will supervise the school staff". More specific direction is provided in the direct reference to evaluation:

> Efficient management of the operation of the school requires that the principal will: assist in the recruitment, selection, placement, and evaluation of school personnel.

Policy 7041, "Supervision and Evaluation", outlines the whole process of teacher evaluation and states "The primary purpose for the supervision and evaluation of teachers is to enhance and maintain a high standard of instruction." The policy also outlines operational requirements, performance criteria, evaluation process, documentation procedures, and personnel involved in evaluation.

The final policy that involves teacher evaluations is Policy 3007, "School Review and Evaluation". The purpose of this policy is stated as "schools will be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis for the purpose of improving and enhancing the quality of education offered to the student." Specific references to teacher evaluation include a review of "the performance of each teacher". It should be noted that a separate document (Jesse, 1985), other than the

Policy Handbook, is published to outline and add further details to the School Review and Evaluation Program.

Teacher Evaluation / Present Situation

The following is a composite picture of the Red Deer District Teacher Evaluation Program. It was constructed from the information gathered during the taped interviews of Red Deer School District educators. It is meant to be an overall impression gained from the commemts made by all stakeholders.

The purpose of improving teachers' performance through teacher evaluation came through loud and clear during my interviews. As one teacher stated:

> I think they're looking for quality teaching. They're looking to improve, on a constant basis, the quality of teachers. They're looking to support the positive aspects of teaching that they do see currently, and I think to develop and look for some common threads throughout the system.

This purpose was reiterated by an administrator:

> I think the purpose of teacher evaluation is to improve the teaching performance of our teachers. That's the primary one. I think a secondary objective, which is still strong, is to have data that show to interested groups that we do have a good teaching staff and good programs. And third, to give Central Office an idea of the performance of teachers. You know who is strong, who isn't. And I've mentioned those in that order deliberately.

Within this broad purpose, teacher evaluation seems to have four basic dimensions, evaluation for tenure and permanent certification, regular on-going supervision and evaluation by in-school administrators, teacher evaluation

as part of the school or program review process, and finally a distinct evaluation and supervision program for teachers who are experiencing difficulties.

Tenure and permanent certification. This type of evaluation tends to be a joint project between a coordinator from central office and one of the in-school administrators, although it is the major responsibility of the coordinator. At the beginning of the year, first year teachers and those in their first or second year in Red Deer District are allocated to the coordinators according to the teacher's subject specialization. (This is not always totally possible as an effort is made to allocate those teachers being evaluated evenly among the coordinators.)

The general process or methodology of evaluation is similar from coordinator to coordinator. All make early contact in September with their assigned teachers and use these early informal visits to orientate and to lower the anxiety of the teachers. In these early sessions criteria are outlined and the yearly evaluation process discussed. There is an effort to try to be a consultant and a coach and assure the teacher that the coordinator is there to help even though, in the end, he will evaluate the teacher too. The formative - summative tension that exists in teacher evaluation and supervision is dealt with in this manner.

The number of visits made by a coordinator varies from six times in a year to twenty times, depending on the number

of teachers a coordinator has and the progress the teacher is making during the year. Those experiencing difficulties in the early part of the year would be visited more often. The length of each visit varied from 30 minutes to 80 minutes depending on the grade level or length of class period.

The first few visits tend to be informal but after these preliminary sessions the evaluations become much more formal. Most of the coordinators follow a similar routine. They do not have a pre-conference with the teacher but arrive at the classroom unscheduled. There may be a brief discussion just before class starts (one of the coordinators did have a pre-conference similar to the clinical supervision routine, to discuss the objectives of the lesson and areas to be observed), but generally the procedure used consists of the coordinator script-taping (a la Madeline Hunter) on carbon paper with comments placed beside the record of classroom events.

At the end of the class a carbon copy of the script tape is given to the teacher and a post conference is scheduled. In most cases this post-conference would occur at a later time. In fact, one coordinator put it this way, "Both of us need the delay" -- as to think through and come up with some positive reactions. During the post-conference positive commendations are provided and recommendations are given.

On completion of from 3 to 10 of this type of

observation, the coordinator writes up the final report. The deadline for these reports for tenure and permanent certification is the end of April. This is where the principal is involved. In fact, the coordinator generally communicates with the principal throughout the year on the progress of the teacher. When it comes to the final report, both the principal and coordinator can co-sign a common letter or each write a separate report. In either case the letter consists of a list of commendations (ie. continue to do ...) and some recommendations (ie. consider doing ...) and occasionally some mandated changes (must do ...). The evaluation letter is discussed with the teacher, principal, and coordinator at a meeting. Then all sign the letter and each gets a copy. One copy is filed at central office. If the principal or coordinator disagree on the granting of tenure or certification, the matter is referred to the superintendent for further review. This process will be outlined later in the chapter under "teachers in difficulties".

The evaluation of first year (tenure) and second year (permanent certification) teachers seems to be very similar from one coordinator to another. This is probably due to a very specific policy on these types of evaluations (Appendix 16) and the in-service that coordinators and superintendents have been receiving concerning report writing, script-taping, dealing with problem teachers, case studies, etc. Teacher evaluation as part of a school or program

review is also very much the same. (Note: a program review at the High School is completed in place of a total school review because of the sheer size of the one and only high school in the Red Deer District.)

School review. School and program reviews are very involved and include all aspects of the school. As the superintendent indicated, teachers and teaching are only part of a school; it is important when evaluating teachers that it occur in the context of the whole "milieu" of the school. Thus students, parents, administrators, and support staff are all interviewed and the facility itself is scrutinized. Teacher evaluation is an intergral part of the review process. However, I will not attempt to describe the whole school or program review process, but will attempt to extract and outline the teacher evaluation component of this process.

The superintendent is the chairman of the review team. He completes the principal's evaluation (this will be described in detail under "Evaluation of administrators") and is also assigned two teachers to observe just like the other members of the team. The team usually consists of all members of central office, a few principals and vice principals from other schools in the district, and some outside specialists (eg. a physical education specialist from Regional Office, a superintendent from another jurisdiction, etc.). The size and composition of the team

depends on the size of the school (ie. number of teachers) or in the case of the program reviews on the subject area (English or Social Studies for example). The team may include administrators or outside specialist who have some interest or expertise in this area.

Once the team is chosen, each member is assigned two teachers to observe. One observer is responsible for writing the teacher evaluation report. In the week or two preceding the actual review days, the evaluators make at least two informal and unscheduled visits to their assigned teacher's classroom, in order to get a more accurate impression of the teacher. A schedule of visits for the actual review day is arranged with the teacher.

On the review day each evaluator visits his/her two assigned teachers, usually script-taping and leaving a carbon copy for the teacher. Most of the evaluators also are assigned to review some other aspects of the school, for example facility, support staff, administration, library, etc. At the end of the same day the team meets in a round table discussion with the principal and vice principal in attendance. Each teacher is discussed and the two evaluators outline their observations and ask the principal and vice-principal for their in-put. If both are positive about the teacher, the pre-assigned evaluator is directed to write a report.

However, if there is some disagreement or concern, an alternate procedure is used. As Ken Jesse states:

> If someone has had some serious problems, you are not allowed in that round table discussion, to discuss that teacher. The person who ... has observed those serious problems is expected to have told the teacher, 'Hey, I'm concerned about what I have seen. These are my concerns and I will be meeting with the superintendent and reviewing these concerns'.

Thus, teachers in difficulties are not discussed in the team meeting and are handled in a different manner. This procedure will be described later.

After all the teachers have been discussed, the team generates recommendations for the whole school review and the superintendent is responsible for writing the report. After further discussion with the team, the total report is presented by the superintendent to the staff. In the few days following the review each teacher meets with the evaluators and the principal. His/her evaluation is discussed, signed, and then filed at central office.

This type of school or program review occurs approximately every three years. It should be noted that if a school review occurs when a teacher is being evaluated for tenure or permanent certification, these evaluations are combined with the school review so that the teacher does not go through more than one major evaluation in that year.

Regular in-school evaluation/supervision. As well as the teacher evaluations mentioned previously, in-school administrators carry on regular evaluation and supervision. My interviews with the administrators indicate that there is no single, common system in use. However, there were a few

common features. First, all teachers in the school, not just first or second year teachers, were being visited in their classroom. Second, both principals and vice principals were involved in the evaluation process and on-going in-service at district wide administrators meetings to improve evaluation techniques. Third, the process in general, and the final reports, tended to be very similar, probably due to the district wide common in-service. Finally, all used script-taping as the means of gathering data during observations of the teaching process and all stated they leave a copy of their rough notes with the teacher after each visit.

The actual evaluation process, however, was quite varied from school to school and administrator to administrator. This diversity and flexibility seems to develop out of each administrator's personal style and the district's willingness to allow and maybe even encourage personal initiative and development.

The first variation is that no set cycle of teacher evaluations was in evidence. One school was on a 3 year cycle, another on a 2 year cycle, yet another evaluated teachers every year. Second, the number of formal classroom visits ranged from 3 to 6 times a year. Some of the administrators stated that there were also many informal visits, or "walk-throughs" which helped them develop an overall impression of the teacher's performance. The length of each visit depended on the grade level or length of

classes, from 30 to 60 minutes.

Most in-school administrators mentioned and indicated that their evaluation criteria were based on the Madeline Hunter Model, and the processes used were variations of the clinical supervision model, with a few using pre- and post-conferences. In the post-conferences, the positive points and possible areas to work on are discussed.

One administrator wrote a mid-year report, while most completed a yearly report in letter form that listed the commendations and the suggested recommendations. All discussed the results with the teacher, and both parties signed the letter. Not all stated that the letter was filed at central office, but each of the evaluators and teachers received a copy of the letter.

The slightly different process of evaluation among principals did not seem to adversely effect the quality of the overall process of evaluation of teachers across the district, as most teachers stated that they saw it as a very 'positive' and 'constructive' process.

Teachers in difficulties. No matter when a teacher is identified as having difficulties -- during the first year, during a school review, or even when an experienced teacher is identified either by the regular in-school evaluation or as a result of a concern expressed by parents -- the superintendent coordinates these cases.

In the case of a first year teacher the supervising

principal and specialist coordinator are expected to notify the superintendent very early in the year of the difficulties and keep him up-to-date. If the problems are not cleared up, then a third person is added to the process. The third person coordinates a remedial program which lasts at least three months. As the superintendent stated:

> First year contracts and certification, plus the regular supervision, have to be processes that go alongside this. On the first year contracts and certification, I expect the report from the principal and the report from the subject specialist, so that two people are working with that person all the way through the first two years on a regular basis and they are both reporting and they're both independent reports. We really want, if someone runs into trouble, to insert a third person, a deputy superintendent or myself, so we have three opinions. We hire that way and we supervise that way.

If the teacher does not improve after the remedial period, then a final evaluation is completed by a third party, either the superintendent or deputy superintendent. At this point an interview with the teacher would be held and a "counselled resignation" would be the preferred outcome. As Ken stated:

> One of the interesting things that has occurred in the process is that we have not had to terminate one teacher as a result of it and we have had, I think, something like twelve resignations, not one termination.

In the school review process, as mentioned before, if a teacher is identified as having difficulties he/she is not discussed at the round table post-review discussions. The superintendent takes control of the situation. Ken summarized:

> We ... meet with that person [to] discuss ... concerns and then try to put an improvement program in place. You just have to protect the ethics in that process, and that's how we protect ethics.

If after at least three months of remedial work the teacher has not improved, a "counselled resignation" is, usually, the next step. However, in 80% of the cases, teachers who are experiencing difficulties and have been on a remedial program improve and continue with the system.

Evaluation of administrators. Although, my major concern in this research project is teacher evaluation, I feel that the fact that all administrators in the district are evaluated, effects the overall impression of evaluation by teachers. Thus, I will briefly outline the evaluation of the superintendent, the deputy and assistant superintendent, the coordinators at central office, and the in-school administrators (both the principal and vice principal).

The superintendent described his own evaluation in the following way:

> ... I'm evaluated each year and we just use a rating form. I don't use a rating form on anybody else, but I do with myself, just to get the thing done, I think, and also to identify the job. As there's only one superintendent, I think the role must be specified. All the administrators in the district complete the form. The teachers complete it, the trustees complete it,...

As for other members of central office, the superintendent evaluates the deputy and assistant superintendent and two coordinators, while the deputy superintendent evaluates the other six coordinators. Both the superintendent and deputy

use the same technique to evaluate the coordinators. They choose a group of teachers and administrators to interview. Some of this group have been suggested by the coordinator being evaluated and some are chosen by the evaluator. The process includes a survey instrument or questionnaire, individual interviews, the administrators perceiver questionnaire and other information about projects that may have been worked on in that year. Also, questions have been include in program and school review questionnaires that pertain to the leadership provided by central office coordinators. Once all the information has been gathered, an oral and written report is given to the coordinator being evaluated and then the report is passed to the superintendent and finally to the board. This process is completed every other year.

Principals on the other hand are evaluated during the school review process, in which the superintendent will use a climate survey filled in by teachers and surveys and questionnaires completed by teachers, parents and students. As Ken outlined, the principals' evaluations includes interviews of groups of four or five teachers by the superintendent to discover:

> the relationships, processes, self-initiative, on the part of the principal. That has to be a positive interview. There's no opportunity for criticism there. It's more a finding out how things are done rather than what's done. If the teachers are concerned and say 'Hey we've got concerns, we can't go though this', then I immediately stop the interview and meet with the principal to establish a different process.

Students are also interviewed by the superintendent. As he stated, "we rely very heavily on talking to the people that they [the principal] provide leadership for, interviewing them plus also learning their priorities and their achievements". Thus, the principal is evaluated when the school is reviewed and the superintendent would meet with the principal and discuss the results of the evaluation.

Vice-principals also are evaluated by staff questionnaires. However, as most are teaching, they also are evaluated as teachers during the school review process. As the superintendent stated, "everybody's either being evaluated or they are the evaluator".

The Red Deer Public School Teacher Evaluation Program seemed to be very much a team approach with all levels of staff involved and in some measure being asked to evaluate others. Even teachers are given a chance to have input into the evaluation of in-school and central office administrators.

Strengths and Weaknesses

All interviewees were asked to outline what they felt were the strengths and weaknesses of the Red Deer Public Teacher Evaluation Program.

Strengths

After categorizing each of the comments that was given

by the interviewees and then grouping the comments, five strengths emerged. The first two were mentioned the most, accounting for 55% of the comments. The third strength drew about 20% of the comments while the last two accounted for about 20% of the statements. The five strengths were;

(1) the teacher evaluation program relied on a positive/collegial approach which built trust among participants;

(2) the teacher evaluation program produced improvement in teachers and the resulting positive impact on teaching was beneficial to students;

(3) the program provided accountability,

(4) the policies of the teacher evaluation program provided a classification of effective teaching criteria and objectives, and

(5) feedback and follow-up was an integral part of the teacher evaluation program.

Table 4.6

Rank Order of Strength Responses by Stakeholder Group

	Teachers	In-school Administrators	Central Office Administrators	Overall
Positive/ Collegial	1 (45)	1 (45)	4 (16)	1 (33)
Produces Improvement	2 (24)	5 (7)	1 (35)	2 (23)
Feedback/ Follow-up	3 (21)	4 (10)	5 (8)	4 (13)
Account-ability	4 (10)	2 (21)	2 (22)	3 (18)
Clarity of Objectives	5 (0)	3 (17)	3 (19)	4 (13)

Collegial approach. The relationship between evaluators and teachers had been open and allowed good communication. Both in-school administrators and teachers saw this as the most important strength, and in fact mentioned this aspect twice as often as did central office personnel. As one in-school administrator stated:

> It is done in such a gentle, caring, guided, coached way, and is done as a group, as a team, together, rather than as a superior dominating or controlling teachers and saying 'This is the way you must do it.'

The program had built trust and, as over half of the comments indicated, is a very positive experience. As one teacher stated,

> ...it's a very positive thing, too. They support what they see as good teaching and refer to that and if they do have any recommendations, it's a non-threatening form of recommendations.

Other comments that indicated that this positive, trusting atmosphere was built as part of the teacher evaluation system include, "clarification of values between teacher and evaluator", "very positive emphasis", "fair", "positive model", "flexibility and latitude", "and finally "input from lots of people". The superintendent outlined this as a significant strength, "Our teachers ... trust us and there's a great deal of support for what we do."

Producing improvement. The superintendent's comment that "this is making a difference", highlights the second strength, that the teacher evaluation program in Red Deer District is producing results. It is improving teachers and schools, teaching methods, and student test results. Most

of the comments came from central office administrators, although teachers made about a third of the comments.

Some comments indicated that there was improvement in teachers and schools. They include "good for the profession", "keeps you on your toes", "improves schools", "focus on improvement", "maintains standards", and "raises level of concern". One teacher stated "It's improving my teaching and I'm sure it's improving the teaching in this system .... I'm 30-40% better than I [would be] if I don't think someone will be coming into evaluate me". Similar benefits were mentioned for students such as "fair for students by setting a standard", "raises test scores", and "insures curriculum is being covered". Ken Jesse put it this way:

> We do want to have the best staff that we can possibly get. We want to develop them and we want to have an impact on the students.

Accountability. Accountability was not seen as keeping track of weak teachers but, as one central office administrator stated, "We recognize top-notch teachers as well." Most of the comments came from central office and in-school administrators. Some of the comments from central office administrators included "evaluation is regular", "evaluation is actually happening", "helps keep central office on top of what's happening", "principals have become more familiar with staffs" and, as another central office administrator stated:

> It raises [student test] scores. We're one of the highest in the province and I think one of the main reasons is our central office people are at schools all the time and the schools are more accountable to us.

In-school administrators drew attention to the positive effects of getting into classrooms, such as "teachers have a record of their teaching", "recognizes good service", "strengths are identified", and "shows we are doing a good job". One administrator indicated that teachers expected evaluators in their classrooms and this was not totally disagreeable to the teachers as one teacher stated it was "good to see central office in my classroom". But one central office administrator recognized another aspect of accountability as follows:

> Many times the focus is on the weak teacher. It shouldn't be. It should be to reinforce the strengths of our very, very, fine teachers.

Clarity of goals and objectives. Knowledge of the process and criteria against which teachers are evaluated also was considered critical to this feeling of clarity. It is interesting to note that no teacher mentioned this as a strength. However, the superintendent stated:

> The quality of the supervisory and evaluation staff and the clear focus that each of them have in terms of priorities and trying to achieve all of them is the greatest strength.

Both central office and in-school administrators tended to agree. They commented "It's a system - it's not hap-hazard", "making us aware of the whole process of monitoring", "teacher's have been made aware of what the whole intent of the evaluation is", "focus on improvement",

"there's a lot more consistency in terms of philosophy and continuity", "there's a lot of clear objectives stated", "it's a planned, set, organized program", and "no surprises for people".

The knowledge of the process and criteria against which teachers are evaluated was also considered crucial. As for in-school administrators, one stated that "It gives the evaluator a chance to be fair and reasonable [toward] the teachers he's evaluating, because of the knowledge of the process". Other comments include, "knowledge of criteria by evaluator and evaluatee", "specific criteria that both evaluator and evaluatee know", "common vocabulary [and] language", and "everyone is kept aware of the process".

Feedback and follow-up. Teachers felt this was more important than did both administrator groups. Teachers stated that "immediate feedback" was excellent and that "support of good teaching through recommendations" was important. The fact that it "points out strengths as well recommendations" was very helpful. They also pointed out that knowing it was an "on-going" process and that they had "accessibility to evaluators" indicated that the feedback and follow-up were meant to help them improve and grow as teachers.

Administrators saw the feedback aspect as a strength as well. In-school administrators saw follow-up after evaluations as important. The need to give teachers feedback, not just positive but productive, constructive

feedback and recommendations, was very essential. Central office administrators stated "problems need to be clearly stated", and that the evaluation needs to be both "summative and formative". One administrator stated "Our teachers are getting some feedback on their instructional techniques and they're feeling good about the recognition they're getting".

Weaknesses

In most cases interviewees felt that the present teacher evaluation system was more then adequate but that improvements could be made in some areas. Some actually preferred to comment on, "areas where improvements might be made" rather than weaknesses. The four main areas for improvement were (1) evaluation procedures, (2) time and other resources commited, (3) the formative/summative tension in the coordinators' role, and (4) the danger of over-evaluation.

Table 4.7

Rank Order of Weakness Responses by Stakeholder Group

	Teachers	In-School Admin.	Central Office Administrators	Overall
Evaluation Procedures	1 (88)	1 (39)	2 (30)	1 (49)
Over-evaluation	2 (12)	3 (11)	4 (8)	4 (10)
Time/Resource Commitment		1 (39)	1 (35)	2 (26)
Formative/Summative Tension		3 (11)	3 (27)	3 (15)

Evaluation procedures. Teachers were the most concerned and made half of the comments, while the in-school and central office administrators contributed the other half. Four main areas of concern about the evaluation procedures emerged.

First, it was felt that there was a need for longer visits. Teachers were the most vocal about this point. They felt that evaluators needed to spend not only more time per visit but needed to visit more often. Also a concern was expressed about the teacher evaluation component of the school review process; some felt that the evaluation should be spread over more then one day.

Second was the feeling that more follow-up needed to be carried out. The majority of responses in this category came from central office administrators. Most felt that the difficulty here was finding the time to visit and work with teachers.

Third was the feeling that input was needed from other sources such as parents and other teachers. Some felt that "peer coaching" or "self-evaluation" should be included in the evaluation process.

Other areas of concern that were mentioned by individual interviewees were that the criteria needed to be made consistent (especially by evaluators from outside the Red Deer School District), ethical concerns (eg. teachers' input into principal evaluation), loss of individuality or spontaneity of teaching styles, recommendations in teacher evaluation reports interpreted as weaknesses, reports that tend to become very similar, and evaluation not being tough enough.

Time and resource commitment. These comments reflected a concern about the future ability of the District to continue to provide support to the program. As the superintendent stated:

> The funding required to keep it going is always at risk and that's a weakness, in the sense that you are wondering if the funding is going to be there - not from the board level, more from the province. There are so many demands on the funding these days, in so many areas, that you're always torn between what can we afford to do and what do we want to do. And it's a real issue.

> It's a much bigger issue than people are being led to believe, in my mind.

This concern for commitment was mentioned by both groups of administrators. Central office personnel saw it as the greatest concern. This may have been the result of their heavy time commitment to teacher evaluation. As more demands are placed on them, will they be able to maintain the time commitment necessary to continue teacher evaluation? Also, as funding decreases, it will be "difficult to keep evaluation of teachers as a priority, year after year". Related to the concern over time commitment is concern about the on-going training of evaluators.

Formative vs. summative supervision. Almost all central office administrators and some in-school administrators saw this as a concern. Some felt their role had become more difficult and that there was a "loss of rapport" with teachers. The fact that "the role of evaluator was not totally defined", and that the coordinator was becoming "more of a policeman then a helper" worried most of the coordinators. One coordinator summed it up as follows:

> There are some teachers who become a little over apprehensive about the evaluation and are concerned about which hat we're wearing when we walk into the classroom. If we lose anything out of that, it's maybe a rapport that we have developed with some of our teachers in the past, when we were looked upon as consultants.

Too much evaluation. All three groups equally felt that this may develop into a significant concern in the future.

As one administrator stated "At what point is it enough?" A teacher felt that supervision was "too big a deal" and another felt that more informal supervision by the "principal or superintendent dropping in" type, was needed. As one administrator stated:

> I don't think we should close our eyes to other models just because we've established one. I think we should be continuing to look to improve the process of evaluation.

Many of the evaluators who were interviewed expressed this sentiment.

CHAPTER 5

Analysis of Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is threefold: (1) to compare the characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program as identified in a review of the literature, a survey of Alberta Superintendents, and a case study of the Red Deer Public School District; (2) to compare the policies pertaining to teacher evaluation adopted by RDPSS against the procedures actually being used in the District, as revealed by the case study; and (3) to review the implementation process of the teacher evaluation program to gain a perspective on what the future might hold for this program.

Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program

Before making the comparisons and developing a composite set of characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program, a brief recapitulation of the findings is probably useful.

Review of the Literature

As outlined in Chapter 2, the RAND study conducted by Wise et al (1985) proved to be a fairly representative indicator of what one encounters in the literature. The five characteristics which the Rand Study highlighted are:

1. Consistency. The evaluation program must suit the educational goals, management styles, concepts of teaching and values of the school jurisdiction.

2. Commitment. There needs to be top-level commitment of both leadership and resources.

3. Compatibility. The main purpose of the teacher evaluation program must be decided, known by all, and the process matched to this purpose.

4. Competency. The teacher evaluation process must have utility, be efficient and the evaluators must be knowledgeable in order to provide reliability and validity.

5. Collaboration. Teacher involvement, in-put, and responsibility helps make the teacher evaluation program effective.

Survey of the Superintendents - Phase 1

The questionnaires sent to all superintendents in Alberta identified the following six characteristics:

1. Knowledge. This was a knowledge or understanding of the policies and procedures by all personnel in the

jurisdiction and included the need to have policies in place.

2. Feedback / Follow-up. This was the need to provide teachers with constructive feedback after evaluation in order that teachers see evaluation as useful and valuable.

3. Training. This was the need for training and in-service of both teachers and evaluators which results from top-level commitment and support.

4. Cooperation. This was the need for in-put and cooperation from the teachers being evaluated.

5. Research. This was the need for the evaluation program to be based on research and a model of teaching and should include consideration of local conditions and factors.

6. Trust. This was the need for trust to be developed through having a process of appeal, time to develop the program, consistency in evaluations, and most importantly a positive overtone.

Case Study - Phase 2

Interviews with teachers, in-school administrators, and central office administrators in the Red Deer system identified the following five characteristics as the strengths of that District's teacher evaluation program:

1. Collegiality. Through the use of a positive approach to reporting teacher performance, a trustful

atmosphere developed.

2. Utility. The program is seen to have utility, it produces results, makes a difference, and leads to improvement in teacher performance.

3. Accountability. The program provides administrators with knowledge of both weak teachers and recognition of strong teachers.

4. Clarity of Objectives. The knowledge of goals, processes and criteria for effective teaching provides all stakeholders a clear view of the goals.

5. Feedback / Follow-up. After all evaluations, teachers are provided with immediate feedback and constructive recommendations, which helps give them a feeling of trust and opportunities for professional growth.

Table 5.1 provides a comparison of these three lists.

Table 5.1

Summary of Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program

Literature (RAND)	Alberta Superintendents	Case Study Red Deer
1. Consistency	1. Knowledge	1. Collegiality
2. Commitment	2. Feedback	2. Utility
3. Compatibility	3. Training	3. Accountability
4. Competency	4. Cooperation	4. Clarity
5. Collaboration	5. Research	5. Feedback
	6. Trust	

Synthesis

Analysis of Table 5.1 suggests that an effective teacher evaluation program is characterized by seven distinct features: consistency, commitment, compatibility, competency, collaboration, feedback, and trust. Table 5.2 provides another perspective on the derivation of this list.

Table 5.2

Combined List of Characteristics of an Effective Teacher Evaluation Program

	Literature (RAND)	Alberta Superintendents	(Red Deer) Case Study
1. Consistency	x	x	x
2. Commitment	x	x	x
3. Compatibility	x	x	x
4. Competency	x	x	x
5. Collaboration	x	x	
6. Feedback		x	x
7. Trust		x	x

Note: x denotes support or acknowledgement of the characteristic.

Although there is not a perfect match in all cases and many of the attributes overlap into other elements, the above seven characteristics seem to constitute the clearest "factor solution". There was total agreement on the first four characteristics and agreement by at least two sources on the last three characteristics.

Consistency. The RAND study identified consistency insofar as it highlighted the need for the teacher evaluation program to suit the goals, concepts and values established by the district. The superintendents in this study felt that because: the evaluation program was based on research and a model of teaching, and everyone knew and understood the evaluation program, that it would be consistent. In Red Deer District the clarity of objectives and the knowledge of the goals, processes, and criteria of effective teaching led to consistency.

Commitment. In the RAND study commitment was viewed as top-level commitment of both leadership and resources. In this study superintendents saw commitment taking the form of training and in-service for all involved in the teacher evaluation program. The case study suggested that a Board must give full commitment in the form of (a) the full support of the superintendent and other central office administrators in actually conducting teacher evaluation, and (b) time to in-service and to complete evaluations.

Compatibility. In the RAND study compatibility referred the matching of the main purpose for evaluation and the

process of evaluation. The superintendents in this study indicated that once a model of teaching is derived from research and knowledge, then the evaluation process must be made consistent with those findings. The interviewees in the case study felt that the teacher evaluation program would be compatible (and effective) only if it was true to the objectives , the goals, the processes, and the indicators of effective teaching that had been established previously.

Competency. This fourth characteristic was viewed in the RAND study as the need to have efficiency in the evaluation program. This was developed by evaluators who were competent, which in turn provided reliable, valid and cost effective evaluation results. The superintendents in this study also saw the need for the training of evaluators. The RDPSD case study revealed that a "competent" system -- one that made a difference -- is a system that has clear objectives, goals, processes, and criteria.

Collaboration. In the RAND study collaboration included the involvement of teachers and indicated that teachers should assume some of the responsibility in development and implementation. Superintendents in Alberta also saw the need for cooperation and in-put from teachers. In the RDPSD case study it was evident that teacher involvement and in-put in the development and implementation of teacher evaluation was limited, but on the whole the teachers interviewed indicated that they were satisfied with the

teacher evaluation program and were very cooperative.

Feedback and follow-up. These two characteristics -- feedback and follow-up after teacher evaluation -- although not specifically mentioned in the RAND study, were seen as critical and essential by both the superintendents and the educators in the Red Deer Public School District.

Trust. This seventh characteristic was also considered important by the Red Deer educators and the Alberta superintendents. The development of a climate of trust was felt to be crucial and was the result of a very collegial, positive approach to the teacher evaluation program.

Correspondence Between Policy and Practice

In this section of the analysis, the Red Deer's system's policies pertaining to teacher evaluation will be compared to the practices and processes that were uncovered in the interviews. The following policies will be considered: the Goals of the Red Deer Public School District, the Roles of the Evaluators, the Supervision and Evaluation Policy, the School Review Program, and the Program and System reviews.

Goals of Education

The principal goal in Policy 1000 (Appendix 16a) is:

> To enable each student to develop to the fullest extent such talents and abilities as he may

> possess so that he may become an active and competent citizen in his contemporary society.

The policy indicates that there is a "need to seek evidence, to evaluate existing programs, changes in curriculum, teacher effectiveness, special services, and administrative organization". This board has certainly tried to "seek evidence" of teacher effectiveness through its evaluation program. Whether this district is in fact enabling students to reach their potentials is very difficult to ascertain. However, if we can believe the teachers and administrators of the Red Deer District, they would say that they are accomplishing this goal. The emphasis on teacher development and improvement tends to support the fact that teacher effectiveness is a concern. When educators in Red Deer were asked "What are the goals of education?", the majority cited "student development".

Role Descriptions

The following are the individual policies that outline the role and job description of the administrators who are involved in teacher evaluation in the R.D.P.S.D.

Superintendent of Schools. In policy 3005 (Appendix 16b), the superintendent's duties include "evaluation of the staff and system". My conclusion is that the superintendent, Ken Jesse, has fulfilled this particular role. He has worked to develop and implement not only

teacher and system evaluation but has led the development of an innovative school review program. His previous experiences, leadership, and dedication to this evaluation program have been instrumental in bringing Red Deer Public School District recognition from educators across North America; the school review program, which has been recently described and evaluated in Jesse and Cooper, (1987), has become renowned.

The role that the superintendent has actually adopted in all of the evaluations seemed very clear and predictable. Nonetheless, his duties are not outlined, other than in very broad terms, in either of the board policies or The School Review and Evaluation Program document, (Jesse, 1985). For example, the superintendent is primarily responsible for overseeing the operation of a program for "teachers in difficulty", but this is not reflected in board policies.

Assistant Superintendent. Policy 3009 (Appendix 16e) indicates that the Assistant Superintendent - Personnel and Administration is responsible for supervising and evaluating staff members. This role is indeed carried out and a number of first and second year teachers are assigned and evaluated for tenure and certification.

Deputy Superintendent. Policy 3010 (Appendix 16f) states that the deputy assists the superintendent and is responsible to "supervise and evaluate staff members." This

he does. He is assigned a number of teachers to evaluate for tenure and certification each year. Again, specifics as to the numbers, timing, and responsibility for the final report are not outlined in the policy.

He is also responsible for the supervision and evaluation of the coordinators at central office and to assist in evaluation of in-school administrators and schools. Again, this is done despite the lack of specific perscriptions in the Board's policies.

Coordinators. These eight central office administrators have responsibility for assisting and advising staff and to "assist in supervision and evaluation of staff members". This is the area of concern that was mentioned by coordinators in the interviews and emphasizes the contradictions that are apparently inherent in summative and formative supervision. It is sometimes difficult to assist and advise a teacher in "developing effective instructional methods and strategies" while evaluating those very same methods and strategies.

The coordinators do indeed evaluate first and second year teachers for tenure and certification but again there are no specific expectations outlined in Board policy. Also, their involvement in school reviews was not indicated in policy 7010. This may partially account for the variation in the procedures used by the coordinators, for example the number of visits, length of visits, etc. It should be

mentioned that the final format of the evaluation report, although unique to each coordinator, seemed to follow the same basic format of commendations (continue doing), recommendations (consider doing), and problem areas (must do).

Principals. The principals (and vice principals) in fact were regularly/consistently involved in teacher evaluation, as part of a regular yearly cycle and as co-evaluators of first and second year teachers for tenure and certification. However, the reference to this role in policy 7020 (Appendix 16h), is very general; the policy includes only the following: "supervise the school staff" and "assist in the recruitment, selection, placement, and evaluation of school personnel". The fact that the procedures of each school principal were unique, may in fact result from this lack of specificity in policies. It should also be noted that no reference is made to the role of the vice principal in the evaluation of teachers in any of the policies were in fact, they were very much involved. Also, as some of the principals indicated it was difficult to complete the role of evaluator and at the same time the role of "consultant" as outline in paragraph 5 (f) of the policy.

Supervision and Evaluation

The pertinent policy (7041, Appendix 16i) outlines the

criteria against which teachers are evaluated. The primary purpose is stated as "to enhance and maintain a high standard of instruction". As most interviewees indicated, they agreed this seemed to be the case. Also outlined in the policy were the aims, operational requirements, and a statement indicating that the listed criteria were to be used as a "guideline only".

The criteria are based in a very general way on the Madeline Hunter Model; however, no specific reference is made to that model. The majority of the respondents mentioned three of the five Hunter criteria. The three mentioned most often were "positive interpersonal relationship with students", "good classroom management skills", and "effective instructional strategies". The other two Hunter criteria, "curriculum knowledge" and "out of class behavior" were seldom mentioned. On the whole, the interviewees, including teachers, knew the majority of the criteria and that there was a policy that listed them. Most of the educators also knew that the criteria had been developed out of the Madeline Hunter in-service training of four years previous.

Policy in this area also outlines a formal (summative) and informal (formative) evaluation process and is an attempt by the Red Deer District to deal with the potential conflict between the roles of consultant and evaluator. The policy doesn't give any specifics as to how, when, or who will carry out either the formal or informal procedures.

The mandated documentation procedures outlined in Appendix 16i, paragraph 5, are being followed by all evaluators. All teachers interviewed knew these procedures and that they could review their personal file at central office. Most principals and coordinators stated they tended to keep a copy of the report for their files and this procedure is not covered by board policy.

Finally, the personnel who are to be involved in teacher evaluation were listed in the policy; however, vice principals were not, even though they do participate in the teacher evaluation program.

School Reviews and Evaluations

This was the most visible and time consuming evaluation program. The program was outlined in Policy 3007 (Appendix 16c) and in more detail in a locally produced handbook called School Review and Evaluation Program. The evaluation of teachers is referred to, and the components to be reviewed include the "performance of each teacher" and "appropriateness of the role-model provided by staff members". In the operational guidelines and procedures teacher evaluation is specifically referred to as follows: "The review shall include evaluation of each teacher's performance".

The only other reference to teacher evaluation is the exhortation "to observe each teacher prior to the general

school review".

The evaluation of the principal is also outlined in the school review policy and, in fact, the school review process is very much an evaluation of the principal's performance in all aspects of the operation of the school. Specifically, the reference to principal evaluation includes "leadership provided by the principal and the administration team" and that the review shall include "evaluation of the principal's performance".

The actual school review and evaluation includes the following components: completing of a personal administrative review form; the articulation of priorities and/or objectives by the principal and the staff; an administrator perceiver interview of the principal; a staff interview by the superintendent; the actual school review visit by the review team, including teacher observations, a school climate profile, parent survey, and an annual achievement report. Outlines and forms for all of the above procedures are included in the School Review and Evaluation Program booklet.

Program Reviews and Evaluations

Policy 8024 (Appendix 16j) has no specific reference to teacher evaluation but does refer to the "leadership offered by the district and school administrators". Part of a coordinator's and principal's evaluation includes the

program(s) he/she is responsible for.

There is one provision in this policy that does not seem to be addressed in practice; this is the "program review at the High School". Red Deer has only one high school. It is very large, with a student population of over 1500 and a teaching staff of over one hundred. A school review has been deemed too complex, therefore program reviews (or department reviews such as Social Studies Department, English Department, etc.) are carried out on a rotating basis. These program evaluations are carried out in a very similar way to school reviews and also include teacher evaluations. Such program reviews, it should be noted, are not the program reviews that are outlined in policy 8024, which was written to address evaluation of division-wide programs in such areas as elementary language arts or junior high math, secondary science, etc.

System Review and Evaluation

In policy 3008 (Appendix 16d), a reference is made to the need to review the "leadership offered by the superintendent and other central office administrators". This is being carried out by the superintendent. The superintendent and deputy have instituted evaluations of the other central office administrators on a three year cycle. Also, on a yearly basis the superintendent evaluates the deputy and uses a survey instrument sent to all teachers and

administrators in the district to evaluate himself.

Summary and Conclusion

It would seem that the policies in Red Deer Public School District that govern the many facets of teacher evaluation are adequate, as the program has been successfully operating for four years. Indeed, the policies for school reviews are very extensive. These policies have been developed and amended as the evaluations were carried out. Thus, they have used experience from the field to provide the in-put needed to develop meaningful policies.

However, there may be a need to develop new policies or clarify present policies in the following areas: regular teacher evaluation procedures by in-school administrators, evaluation procedures for first and second year teachers being evaluated for tenure and certification, the role of vice principals in teacher evaluation, and the program evaluations of the high school.

Factors Affecting Implementation

To examine the implementation of educational change, such as the RDPSD teacher evaluation program, a framework is needed. Fullan (1982) outlines 15 factors that seem to affect the implementation and the continuation of a planned educational change. These factors are not necessarily the only ones that are relevant but they provide useful

structure for examining an implementation of change.

It is also understood that in dissecting a social event, one runs the danger of losing the total picture. However, in order to comprehend a complex phenomenon, we need to view its simpler components. An attempt will be made to put the pieces together in the conclusion of this section in order to gain a perspective on the totality of the implementation.

1. Need and relevance of the change. This factor is interesting, for it seems that the need for teacher evaluation in this district has no one origin. Historically, there was a perceived need by the central office to develop some structure to guide the improvement of instruction. Thus, a strong emphasis and development of the Madeline Hunter model of teaching and supervision was pursued. With the arrival of a new superintendent from a large urban center, where he had been involvement in all aspects of evaluation, a new force was introduced into the "need" factor. The superintendent felt there was an urgent need for specific and organized evaluation of not only teachers, but schools and programs too. Again, this perceived need was a "top-down" as opposed to a "ground swell" or "grass roots" need.

As the literature suggests, if teachers perceive the change as being necessary, there is a better chance of successfully implementing a planned change. Although there

was evidence that some teachers were apathetic toward the development of the teacher evaluation program, the announcement by the Department of Education that all school boards were required to plan and develop a teacher evaluation program, certainly identified that what was being done fulfilled a real need and probably helped emphasize that need.

2. Clarity. False clarity is a concern when discussing this factor. The outward goal presented by the central office was one of development of teacher skills, the improvement of instruction. However, there will always be those that feel the "real" goal is one of eliminating unwanted teachers. This feeling may well have been intensified by the events in Eckville, which in turn were followed by the government's Teacher Evaluation Policy. This school division ensured clarity by consistently providing positive reports to teachers which would reinforce the idea that the intentions of the innovation -- to help teachers -- was in fact being followed.

3. Complexity. The complexity of this innovation seems self evident. The components are complex in themselves. The act of teaching is complex and the features of effective teaching are as yet not universally agreed upon. How and what to evaluate, moreover, are debated and unsettled, and who is to evaluate is not spelled out. This

school district addressed these issues by setting up a model and process to be followed. Then, through the process of trial and error, the evaluation program was developed and improved. As Fullan states(1982:59)

> Difficult changes are attempted because they have the potential to achieve greater benefits, but they must be done in a way which maximizes clarity (through defining specific components and implementing them incrementally).

On this criterion, the Red Deer system scored high.

4. Quality and practicality of program. The school district seems to have worked hard to provide a high quality program that teachers perceive as having not only benefit to the central office (for their own as well as provincial needs), but personal and professional growth. The quality was improved by constant review of the process, constant consultation with evaluators, and training within the district by using mostly district personnel, including teachers, as instructors.

The practicality of the program was ensured by the fact that teachers received feedback immediately. As well as gaining positive recognition for their good teaching strategies, they were also provided with recommendations for improvement and an opportunity to improve through individual programs set-up by the central office consultants and in-service opportunities in the district and abroad.

> For implementation to gather any momentum, teachers and others must experience some sense of meaning and practicality relatively early in the process of

> attempting change; otherwise they will eventually abandon the effort.(Fullan, 1982:62)

5. The history of innovation attempts. Although my research did not deal with all innovations in this district's history, it does appear that the introduction of the Madeline Hunter model was being accepted relatively well, at least by those attending conferences and work-shops. The fact that the incoming superintendent did not abandon this innovation but incorporated it into a more detailed and planned innovation. The fact that the corresponding mandate to evaluate teachers by the province indicated a need, probably meant that this innovation was seen in light of a positive history or at least non-negative.

6. The adoption process. On this dimension of assessment the findings are somewhat contradictory. It seems that in the planning and adoption phase, teacher involvement in decisions was limited if not non-existent. In fact, it seems that only central office and in-school administrators were involved in the discussions and reviews during the implementation. Teachers' only input was as evaluatees and respondents to surveys by the superintendent on the school and the principal. Nonetheless, Fullan (1982:64) states, "It may come as some surprise that participation in adoption decisions and/or development is

not necessarily related to effective implementation." Thus, even though teacher involvement came about only later in the change, during implementation, it was not one of the main factors that led to the effective implementation of teacher evaluation in this school district.

7. Central administrative support and involvement.

Fullan (1982:65) sums up this factor very well:

> The chief executive officer and other key central administrators set the conditions for implementation to the extent that they show specific forms of support and active knowledge and understanding of the realities of attempting to put a change into practice.

In Red Deer this factor seems to have been the main reason for the teacher evaluation program being successful. The superintendent, capitalizing on his past experience and knowledge, has developed a very strong program in which he has devoted a great deal of time and energy. His staff -- including a deputy, an assistant, and eight coordinators -- all have been involved and seem to be determined and enthusiastic about the program. The superintendent's dominant character has had a forceful impact on the innovation, but he has demonstrated his convictions to all personnel in the district and these have also been translated into action.

The superintendent has not paid only "lip-service" to the need for teacher evaluation. His investment of personal time and effort, as well as his demands on the other administrators in the district, have demonstrated his

commitment to this change. Central office personnel have been asked to devote substantial effort to this innovation and priority has been placed on the evaluation policies (schools, teachers, and programs) with time being the most difficult resource to be found. However, with careful scheduling, the necessary time has been found and the implementation and continuance maintained.

8. Staff development and participation. These aspects of change were to some extent being dealt with before the arrival of the superintendent (Madeline Hunter era) and can be classified as pre-service or pre-implementation training. With the development and adoption of the new evaluation program, more pre-service was carried out, essentially at the administrator level. This included meetings to discuss how to evaluate, what to evaluate, and how to report. This training was done within the district and with district personnel -- which Fullan (1982:190) indicated is an effective method of improving the chances of a successful implementation:

> The primary task of the school district should be to develop its own internal capacity to process needed educational change, relying on external assistance to train insiders and to provide specific program expertise in combination with internal follow-through.

The involvement of teachers has been more or less limited to in-service on the criteria against which they will be evaluated. There has been limited input from teachers into the process of the evaluation. Administrators, on the other

hand, have been heavily involved in pre-service, in-service, and post-service training sessions as the programs were reviewed and revised.

9. Time-line and information system (evaluation). As stated by Fullan (1982:69) "a time-line is needed which is neither unrealistically short nor casually long". In retrospect, the Red Deer program seems to have satisfied this criterion. Approximately one year was used to plan and adopt. Another year was devoted to implementing a pilot study and to completing the writing of policy statements. Finally, two more years of implementation of the policy and evaluation of all schools, teachers, and programs in the district completed the cycle.

Secondly, during all of these evaluations, information was gathered from many sources (administrators, teachers, students, parents, and board members). Thus, the process has been reviewed at regular intervals and an effort to "fine tune" at each stage has helped to create a feeling of success and pride.

10. Board and community characteristics. The board and community support appeared positive. It may, in fact, have been strengthened by the Keegstra affair and the political and public pressure on school jurisdictions to "clean-up" their act with regard to ensuring teacher competence. In this school district, the concern was

already being addressed, and this led to the board and parents seeing their superintendent and staff as being "ahead of the game". This built confidence and support. The board then followed with general support of the programs, including permission to use substantial amounts of time to continue with the evaluations.

11. The principal. As all principals were involved in the developing and implementing of the evaluation programs and were involved in training sessions, the chances of success increased. The school review process meant that principals would be evaluated and their own teacher evaluation program would come under scrutiny. For these reasons, the principal is the key at the school level and is heavily involved in teacher evaluation. Principals and vice principals have district meetings regularly in which evaluation is discussed and some in-service is carried out. (This also helps provide a consistent district implementation program.) However, in my interviews with some principals and vice principals (also involved in teacher evaluation), I got the impression that not all were as enthusiastic and did not seem to have the same level of involvement and/or technical knowledge. Thus, the evaluation program may not be implemented as effectively in every school.

12. Teacher-teacher relationships. Not all teachers

saw the program in exactly the same light. Most were supportive and praised the positive nature of the reports, but a few concerns were expressed. These concerns fell mainly into two categories: (1) the fear that the individual nature of the teacher and the subject area would be lost in the bureaucratic, uniform evaluations and (2) that evaluation will become too frequent and dominate the teacher's thinking, therefore displacing the more important goal of teaching students. Overall, however, a positive feeling concerning evaluation was evident.

13. Teacher characteristics and orientations. "Innovators and hard-core resisters are found among all ages and levels of education" (Fullan,1982:72). This was true in this district as well; however, the resistors were a minority and may in fact, have been silenced (at least for the time being) by the success and positive nature of the evaluations. It was made clear to the teachers of the district that the evaluation program was not a "witch hunt" but an attempt to assess teachers' competence and at the same time help them improve. When this is the case, teachers begin to feel good about the process and the "teacher's sense of efficacy" is heightened -- which Fullan (1982:72) feels is important in successful implementation.

14. Role of Government. As has already been indicated, government involvement in this innovation was not

financial or material, but in the form of a mandate, "order from above". However, because this school district was ahead in the process, the provincial mandate for all school jurisdictions in Alberta to implement, maintain, and operate a teacher evaluation system provided utility and justification for the existing program. In turn, this provided justification for board and central office to continue the implementation. As a forerunner and a "good" example of a system with an effective teacher evaluation program, this provided the personnel who were involved in the innovation some notoriety and pride, a feeling of success. (The superintendent has lectured and sent material about the Red Deer system across Canada and the United States, and as well has published articles in education journals.)

15. External assistance. In this situation external assistance has been minimal. The superintendent has brought with him some previous knowledge and experience. As well, some external evaluators were used, but this factor is seen as having minimal influence.

Conclusion

Although the Red Deer Public School District probably did not follow these 15 factors in planning, adopting, and implementing its teacher evaluation programs, high

standards were achieved on all factors. Perhaps not perfect marks, but a good overall collection of positive factors. It would seem, therefore, that the probability of the successful continuation of the evaluation programs is good. As outlined in Fullan (1982:77), "probably the most discouraging prospect in understanding the implementation and continuation process is the realization that it is not linear and is never-ending". Red Deer Public School District has worked to continue to improve its program. All members are involved in the program and the attitude seems generally positive at all levels. The programs provide obvious benefits. The programs have become institutionalized. Thus, as indicated by Fullan (1982:77-78), the chances of this innovation continuing are greatly improved and what more can be expected of a planned change than to have it become used and routine.

CHAPTER 6

Summary, Implications, and Recommendations

This chapter is made up of three major components. First comes a summary of the research project in terms of the purposes and methodology, findings, and conclusions. Second, the findings are related to theory and research. Finally, some recommendations are formalized for school personnel who would like to use the results of this research project in reviewing their teacher evaluation programs.

Summary

Purpose

The overarching objective in this research project was to determine the characteristics of an effective program for teacher evaluation. This objective was pursued in two stages. Both stages were guided by the research question "What are the characteristics of an effective program for teacher evaluation?" and the secondary research questions. The data were gathered using two styles of research methodology, a mailed questionnaire and a modified case study.

The responses to the open-ended questionnaire in Phase

1 and the verbatim transcripts of the interviews in Phase 2 were content analysed and these results summarized into lists of common characteristics. These two lists of characteristics were then compared to each other and the findings from the review of the literature in order to develop an overall composite list of characteristics of an effective teacher evaluation program. (The lists mentioned above are found in Chapter 5.)

Findings -- Phase 1

What are the characteristics of an effective program for teacher evaluation?

Following the review of the literature, five characteristics from a study done by the RAND Corporation were adopted as a framework for summarizing the findings from the literature. That framework comprised of five characteristics: consistency, commitment, compatibility, competency, and collaboration. Two more lists of characteristics were then developed. First, superintendents of Alberta, in a survey of their opinions as to the hallmarks of an effective teacher evaluation system, indicated that there was a need for knowledge, feedback, training, cooperation, research, and trust. Second, a case study based on interviews of personnel in the Red Deer Public School system identified the following factors: collegiality, utility, accountability, clarity, and

feedback.

Findings -- Phase 2

What was the impetus that led to the development of the teacher evaluation program?

In the case of the Red Deer Public School District, a combination of events and circumstances precipitated the development and implementation of a teacher evaluation program. First, a group of administrators felt a need to supervise teachers, investigated some alternatives, and settled on the Madeline Hunter approach to teaching and supervision. Next came an intense training and indoctrination in these techniques. Subsequently a new superintendent provided leadership and guidance in developing the program and policies. Finally, a mandate by the provincial government, provided the final justification.

What were the effects of the local environment on the development of the teacher evaluation program?

The local environment influenced the structure of the program. With administrators already trained in supervision techniques and some teachers having been involved in Madeline Hunter type "effective teaching" sessions, a core of knowledge and competence was established. The relative proximity of all the schools in the urban setting of Red Deer District led to easier communications and contacts

between central office and the schools. The availability of coordinators at central office to assist the superintendent and in-school administrators in conducting teacher evaluation enabled this extensive program to be completed. All these factors led to what the superintendent called "a fertile seed bed" for the development and implementation of the present teacher evaluation program.

What were the steps or processes used to develop the teacher evaluation program?

The steps in development, once the new superintendent had arrived, included (a) reviewing the literature for research based knowledge, (b) developing a "plan of attack" with central office and in-school administrators, (c) carrying out the plan by piloting the evaluation procedures for both the school review (which had a teacher evaluation component) and regular teacher evaluation, (d) constantly reviewing and appraising the results of the program, (e) writing policies that reflected the lessons learned in the preliminary implementation, and (f) constant and regular evaluation of present policies.

What were the underlying goals and purposes of the teacher evaluation program?

There were two definite goals that were pursued. One was the need to improve instruction for the benefit of students. This was both a concern for the students and a

concern for the development of effective teachers. The second goal was one of accountability. In-school and central office administrators wanted to verify that good teaching was happening in Red Deer Public School District and to assure the general public that quality education was being provided to their children. The evaluation allowed administrators to recognize "good" teaching and to assist weak teachers -- improving or changing professions.

What is the current status of the teacher evaluation program?

The main components of the teacher evaluation program are as follows: regular in-school teacher evaluation, carried out on a two or three year cycle by the principal and/or vice principal; the evaluation of first and second teachers for tenure and certification, with the greatest proportion of these evaluations conducted by the central office coordinators; the teacher evaluation component of a school review; and the evaluation of "teachers in difficulty", which includes input from the superintendent's office.

How is the teacher evaluation program integrated with other programs and policies of the school jurisdiction?

The teacher evaluation program is a major part of the school review program, one of the major projects in the Red Deer Public School District. A teacher evaluation completed

in a school review is the same as a regular in-school evaluation or an evaluation for tenure and certification. Duplication is avoided by using school review teacher evaluations for the other purposes in years where they overlap. Other policies such as the Goals of Education of the Red Deer Public School District and the emphasis on teacher and administrator in-service seem to compliment the main goal of teacher evaluation -- to improve instruction for the benefit of students.

How do the major stakeholders (teachers and administrators) view the development and implementation of the teacher evaluation program?

As a whole, educators in Red Deer District felt that teacher evaluation was being conducted very positively and was "making a difference". Each group, however, had some concerns. Some teachers were concerned about over-evaluation and the effects of prolonged anxiety of being evaluated on a more frequent bases then in the past. Some in-school administrators were concerned about the over-evaluating and possibile loss of rapport with teachers in their schools. Central office administrators were concerned about the time allocated to teacher evaluation, particularly insofar as it reduced time available for program and curriculum consultation. Another concern was the loss of rapport with teachers and role as consultant. Finally, the superintendent felt a concern for continuation

of the top-level support for this project. In particular, the dwindling ability of the board to continue to support such a time consuming project in the face of decreases in financial and other resources.

What are the strengths of the teacher evaluation program?

The strengths of the program, as outlined by the educators who were interviewed, are the collegial approach to evaluation, with its positive and trust building elements; the feeling that it was producing constructive results that make a difference; the accountability aspects to both administrators and the public with the identification of weak teachers and the recognition of good work; the clarity of objectives and procedures which enable personnel to know what to expect; and finally the feedback and follow-up that is provided to improve instruction.

What are the weaknesses in the program or what adaptations must be made to insure continued success of the teacher evaluation program?

Four main concerns for the future of the evaluation program in Red Deer District emerged during the interviews. First, the evaluation procedures must be monitored and revised if necessary. Second, time and resource commitments must be continued. Third, the tension between the summative and formative role of evaluators (principals and coordinators) must be considered. Finally, the possibility

of too much evaluation must be guarded against.

What is the future of the teacher evaluation program?

An assessment of this teacher evaluation program, using Fullan's 15-factors model for successful implementation of an educational change (1982), indicates that the implementation was a success and that this program will probably continue in the future with sustained effort and commitment.

Conclusions

In the final analysis, the results of this investigation seem to indicate that the following are essential but not necessarily exclusive to the development of an effective teacher evaluation program:

1. Congruency between the evaluation program and the system's educational goals, management and organizational system, concepts of teaching, and local values.
2. Commitment of top level leadership and the allocation of appropriate resources by Central Office.
3. Congruency between the purposes of teacher evaluation and the process of evaluation.
4. Competency of the evaluators, which leads to efficiency, reliability, and validity of the results.
5. Collaboration of teachers, who cooperate and have input into the teacher evaluation program.

6. Feedback and follow-up provided to teachers, to help them improve and develop professionally.

7. Trust in the evaluation program, developed through a positive and collegial approach.

The major conclusions of this project are first; the successful implementation of a teacher evaluation program does not happen by chance but results from a well planned and implemented program and continues with hard work. Second, the presence of the seven characteristics outlined in the major findings would be very helpful in establishing a successful teacher evaluation program but not all need to be present to achieve success. Third, a teacher evaluation program must be developed with the full recognition of the limitations of the school jurisdiction's past programs, resources, leadership, and evaluators skills. In other words, there is no one best system; a successful program is rooted in local initiative and creativity. Fourth, the first step in developing an effective teacher evaluation program is to become aware of the factors that characterize effective teaching and how these factors will be recognized. All educators who are involved, both evaluators and teachers, must have a basic knowledge of and expertise in identifying these factors. It does not really matter what the factors are; but everyone involved needs to understand what they are and believe in their validity.

Implications

The findings of this research project suggest a number of implications for theory and research on teacher evaluation programs and for practice.

Theory

This study seems to confirm the RAND conclusions regarding the need for consistency, commitment, compatability, and competency in establishing a teacher evaluation program. However, the need for collaboration did not emerge as a major factor in the Red Deer case study. The indications are, instead, that strong leadership may be more important than cooperation and collaboration from teachers. The extensive in-service given to teachers on the teaching model (Madeline Hunter) may have acted as a balance to the limited involvement and in-put from teachers.

Two factors that are not prominent in the literature were designated as critical by Alberta educators: the need for feedback and follow-up, and the need to develop a climate of trust by employing a collegial approach to teacher evaluation. These factors tend to reduce the anxiety felt by teachers during evaluation and make the process more meaningful. Evaluation is generally not enjoyed and these factors make it as palatable as possible.

Research

As indicated in the methodology chapter, a case study is unique; hence the results must be interpreted cautiously. Nonetheless this case study adds some tentative elements to the knowledge of what constitutes an effective teacher evaluation program. Replication of this study in other school jurisdictions in Alberta and other provinces of Canada would help to validate the findings. Further, if such research were to be undertaken, interviews with more than just educators but parents, students and members of the board would provide added perspectives and validation of the findings, reported here. Finally, there were initially some concerns about how the subjects might react to the recording of interviews. However, it was discovered that most interviewees soon ignored the tape recorder and seemed to respond honestly and candidly to questions. It should also be noted that not one person refused to be taped and no one stopped the interview. This reinforced the notion that the interview technique has reliability and validity as a research method.

Recommendations

Although this study focused on a particular school jurisdiction, the research involved multidimensional data finding methods. Thus, the results have some implications for practice in other school jurisdictions where

administrators may be reviewing or implementing a teacher evaluation program. The following are recommendations based on the findings of this research project:

1. Although there may be some application of the characteristics of a successful teacher evaluation program in Red Deer Public, administrators in other school jurisdictions should be cautious and remember the following organizational features of the Red Deer Public School District before adopting the Red Deer model -- close proximity of schools in an urban setting, a relatively large central office with ten administrators available as evaluators, and the commitment to a regular school review program.

2. The evaluation of teachers as part of the whole education process in a school and not as an isolated act (eg. the school review model) has merit and perhaps should be considered an essential part of a complete teacher evaluation program.

3. Total commitment from the board and central office leadership is essential. Without the commitment of the leaders, resources in the way of time needed by evaluators and teachers to complete the actual evaluations, as well as the moral support of the board, this type of program cannot be successful.

4. There will always be some teachers and administrators who are not happy with evaluation -- there is always: the teacher who is not at all confident about

his/her abilities to teach and the administrator who is unsure about his/her ability to evaluate. This is only natural as most people are not totally comfortable with evaluation at any time. However, with a positive overtone, recognition of excellence, openness about the purpose and results of the evaluation, and the fact that all components of the school system are being evaluated (including the evaluators), the resistance of most personnel can be reduced significantly.

5. The need to train all members of the education team is undeniable. Evaluators need to be perceived as competent in both curriculum and evaluation procedures. Teachers need to be in-serviced so that they are not only knowledgeable about the criteria against which they will be evaluated but they must have opportunities to practice the required techniques in their classrooms.

As stated earlier, it is not so much what model of effective teaching is used but rather that a model is chosen, that a general consensus on its validity pervails, and that the model is indeed the focus of the evaluation.

6. Although a teacher evaluation program must follow a plan, flexibility must also be planned into the program. Teaching is a very complex and idiosyncratic process; hence each teacher must be evaluated within a general model of teaching, with allowances for personal initiative and personality. The same is true for evaluators. Some flexibility in the evaluation procedures is indispensible,

to ensure that the evaluation program does not become stifling and sterile.

A final word about teacher evaluation programs was aptly stated by Gephart et al (1979):

> Evaluation is a process that should be evaluated. It is highly unlikely that we will design the perfect evaluation plan for all time. We need to set goals for the evaluation effort and assess the degree to which those goals are attained. The data so generated should be used in decisions about the evaluation procedures and policy.

REFERENCES

Advisory Committee
1986 "Report of the Advisory Committee on Implementing Teacher Evaluation Policies and Programs." Edmonton.

Agar, Michael H.
1980 The Professional Stranger. Toronto,ON: Academic Press.

Alberta Education
1985 Program Policy Manual Third Edition. Edmonton: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education
1985 Ministerial Order 75/85: Council on Alberta Teaching Standards Order. Edmonton, AB: Government of Alberta.

Alberta Education
1985 News Release #8.

Alberta Teachers' Association
1986 "Report stresses openness and trust in teacher evaluation." The ATA News January 27,1986.

Alberta Teachers' Association
1985 Members' Handbook, 1985. The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1985.

Altschuld, J.W. and M.A. Lower
1984 "Improving Mailed Questionnaires: Analysis of a 96 Precent Return Rate." In D.C.Lockhart(ed), Making Effective Use of Mailed Questionnaire, New Directions for Program Evaluation, No.21. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Anzaldua, Gilberto
1984 "National School District Principal Performance Contracts: An Effective Approach to Evaluation." Thrust 14:2 (Oct):15-17.

Armiger, Mary Louise
1981 "The Political Realities of Teacher Evaluation." In J. Millman(ed),Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Barber, L. W.
1982 "Editorial". The CEDR Quarterly 15:4(Winter):2.

Bellon, Jerry J.
1982 "Teacher Evaluation: From the Teacher's Perspective." The CEDR Quarterly 15:4(Winter):9-11.

Bellon, J. J. and E. C. Bellon
1982 Classroom Supervision and Instructional Improvement, 2nd. Ed. Dubuque,IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Bergman, Brian
1985 "Capitalizing on Keegstra." Alberta Report 12:49 (November):34.

Berman, Paul and M. W. McLaughlin
1980 "Factors Affecting the Process of Change." In M.M. Milstein(ed), Schools, Conflict and Change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bogdan, R.C. and S.K. Biklen
1982 Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, W.R. and M.D. Gall
1983 Educational Research. An Introduction. New York: Longman.

Bosetti, R.A.
1985 "Re: Evaluation Policies Management and Finance Plan." Internal memo. Edmonton: Alberta Education,1985.

Braskamp, L., D. Brandenburg, and J. Ory
1984 Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness A Practical Guide. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Brodinsky, Ben and Shirley Boes Neill
1983 "Building Morale, Motivating Staff: Problems and Solutions." Educational News Service,Sacramento, California,No.12 in the ASSA Critical Issues Series. ERIC no. ED227549.

Byrne, T. C.
1967 "The Emerging Role of the Superintendent." In Hodgson, E.D.,J.J.Bergen and R.C.Bryce, The Organization and Administration of Education in Canada. University of Alberta, Department of Educational Administration, Revised Edition: 418-437.

Casteller, William
1981 The Personnel Function in Educational Administration. New York: MacMillan.

Chirnside, Carolyn
1984 "Ten Commandments for Successful Teacher Evaluation." NASSP Bulletin 68:475(November):42-43.

City of Red Deer
1986 Red Deer -- Central Alberta. The Future is Now. Economic Development Department, City of Red Deer.

Cohen, L. and L. Manion
1980 Research Methods in Education. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Cooper, Alan
1986 An Evaluation of The School Review Program in Red Deer Public School District. An unpublished paper presented to the Board of Trustees of Red Deer Public School District, March, 1986.

Darling-Hammond, L., A. E. Wise, and S. R. Pease
1983 "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature." Review of Educational Research 53:3(Fall):285-328.

David, R. K.
1983 "The Firing of James Keegstra." The Canadian School Executive (May):19-21.

Deal, T. E., Barbara Neufeld, and Sharon Rallis
1982 "Hard Choices in Hard Times." Educational Leadership (January):298-302.

Duhamel, R. J.
1983 "Towards Meaningful Teacher Evaluation." The Yellow Papers. Educational Administration,OISE, Toronto, 2:2:9-17.

Duncan, A. N.
1986 "Teacher Evaluation Policies:Board Prerogative or Provincial Mandate?" The ATA Magazine 66:2(January/ February):28.

Duncan, A. N.
1984 An Assessment of Formal Teacher Evaluation Practices in Alberta(Summary). Alberta Education, December, 1984.

Eisner, Elliot W.
1983 "The Art and Craft of Teaching." Educational Leadership (January):4-13.

Eisner, Elliot W.
1981 "On the Differences Between Scientific and Artistic Approaches to Qualitative Research." Educational Researcher 10:4:5-9.

Engel R.A. and D. Friedrichs
1980 "The Emergence Approach. The Interview Can Be a Reliable Process." NASSP Bulletin (January):85-91.

Epstein, J. L.
1985 "A Question of Merit:Principals' and Parents' Evaluations of Teachers." Educational Researcher (August/September):3-10.

Evertson, C. M. and F. M. Holley
1981 "Classroom Observation." In J.Millan(ed), Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Foster, F. and M. Nixon
1976 "The Interview Reassessed." Alberta Journal of Educational Research 21(March):19-21.

Freer, Mark and Jack Dawson
1985 "Don't Evaluate Your Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 66: 10:720-722.

Fris, Joe
1983 "Teacher supervision in Burnaby, B.C." The Canadian School Executive 3:2(June):14-15.

Fullan, Michael
1982 The Meaning of Educational Change. Toronto: OISE Press/ The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Gephart, N.J., R.B. Ingle and M.R. Carroll
1979 "Wrap-Up: The Basis for Evaluating Teaching". In W.R. Duckett (ed), In Planning for the Evaluation of Teaching, A CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kapa, Bloomington, IN:84-93.

Ghitter, R. et al
1984 Committee on Tolerence and Understanding - Final Report. December, 1984.

Goens, George A.
1982 "Myths About Evaluation." Phi Delta Kappan 63:6: 411-420.

Guba, E.G. and Y.S. Lincoln
1982 Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harris, Ben M.
1985 Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hickcox, Edward
1985 "The Sea of Instructional Improvement." Teacher Education 26(April):18-24.

Hickcox, Edward
1983 "Teacher Evaluation:A Little Scepticism is a Good Thing." The Yellow Papers. Educational Administration,OISE: Toronto:2:2:25-29.

Hodgson, E. D.
1984 "The Keegstra mess:an administrative report card." The Canadian School Executive 3:9(March):15-17.

Hodgson, E. D.
1980 "Locally and Provincially Employed Superintendents." In E.D.Hodgson, J.J.Bergen and R.C.Bryce, The Organization and Administration of Education in Canada. University of Alberta, Department of Educational Administration. Revised Edition:390-417.

Holley, Freda M.
1982 "Personnel Evaluation: Essentials for Success." The CEDR Quarterly (Fall):6-8.

Huddle, Gene
1985 "Teacher Evaluation - How Important for Effective Schools? Eight Messages From Research." NASSP Bulletin (March):58-63.

Jaeger, Richard M.(ed)
1980 "Seeking Sweet Water." Alternative Methodologies in Educational Research A study guide by the American Educational Research Association.

Jesse, K. and A. Cooper
1986 "This School Review program works". The Canadian School Executive (December):19-20.

Jesse, Ken
1986 Red Deer Public School District No. 104 School Review and Evaluation Program. An unpublished document, Red Deer, AB.

Jesse, Ken
1985 "Evaluating Teacher Performance." The Canadian School Executive (May):19-20.

Jesse, Ken
1984 "School reviews: pursuing effectiveness." The Canadian School Executive (March):43-44.

Jick, Todd D.
1979 "Mixing Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: Triangulation in Action." Administrative Science Quarterly 24:(December):602-611.

Knapp, M. S.
1982 "Teacher Evaluation Practices Within Schools." The CEDR Quarterly 15:4(Winter):3-5.

Labaw, Patricia J.
1980 Advanced Questionnaire Design. Cambridge, MA ABT Books.

Larson, Richard
1984 "Teacher Performance Evaluation-What are the Elements?" NASSP Bulletin (February):13-18.

Lauro, Dennis R.
1982 "Teacher Evaluation:The Union's Point of View." The CEDR Quarterly 15:4(Winter):19-21.

Levin, Benjy
1982 "Teacher Evaluation:Lessons Learned." Canadian School Executive 1:10:5-8.

Lewis, Anne C.
1982 Evaluating Educational Personnel. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators.

Lyons, Bruce
1985 Improving Instruction Through Teacher Evaluation in Alberta and Western Australia. Unpublished Master's Project, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

MacNaughton, R.H., S. Tracy and J.F. Rogus
1984 "Effective Teacher Evaluation - Process Must Be Personalized, Individualized." NASSP Bulletin (November):1-11.

Mackay, A.
1979 Project Quest:Teaching Strategies and Pupil Achievement. Centre for Research in Teaching, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Research Report #79-1-3.

Manatt, Richard P.
1984 "Competent Evaluations of Teaching: Their Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes". In W.R. Duckett (ed), Competent Evaluator of Teaching, a CEDR Monograph, Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research, Bloomington, IN:5-36.

McGreal, T.L.
1983 Successful Teacher Evaluation. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGreal, T.L.
1982 "Effective Teacher Evaluation Systems." Educational Leadership (January):303-305.

McKenna, Bernard
1982 "A Teacher Organization Perspective." The CEDR Quarterly 15:4(Winter):14-17.

McLaughlin, M. W.
1984 "Teacher Evaluation and School Improvement." Teacher's College Record 86:1(Fall):193-207.

McNeil, John D.
1981 "Politics of Teacher Evaluation." In J.Millman(ed), Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Medley, D., R. Soar, and H. Coker
1983 "The Minimum Conditions for Valid Evaluation of Teacher Performance." Journal of Classroom Interaction 19:1: 22-27.

Mireau, Laurie
1985 Evaluation and Improving Teaching Performance Inservice Kit. Planning Service Branch, Alberta Education, Edmonton, October, 1985.

Mireau, Laurie
1983 "Classroom supervision - no excuses, please!" The Canadian School Executive (June):9-11.

Natriello, Gary, and Sanford Dornbusch
1981 "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals." Administrator's Notebook 29.

Peterson, D. and K. Peterson
1984 "A Research-Based Approach to Teacher Evaluation." NASSP Bulletin (February):39-46.

Platek, R., F.K. Pierre and P. Stevens
1985 Development and Design of Survey Questionnaires. Statistics Canada, Census and Household Survey Methods Division, Minister of Supply and Services, Ottawa, Canada.

Popham, W, J.
1971 Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems. Los Angeles: The Instructional Objectives Exchange.

Prince, J.
1985 "Evaluation for Success." Edmonton, Alberta: Unpublished paper presented at the Conference on Teacher Evaluation, Sponsored by Phi Delta Kappa, University of Alberta, October, 1985.

Rubin, R.
1982 "External Influences on Supervision: Seasonal Winds and Prevailing Climate." In T.J.Sergiovanni(ed), Supervision of Teaching. Alexandria,VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Schein, E. H.
1980 Organizational Psychology, (3rd edition). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Scriven, Michael
1981 "Summative Teacher Evaluation." In J.Millman(ed), Handbook of Teacher Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Saga.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J.
1982 "Toward a Theory of Supervisory Practice: Integrating Scientific, Clinical and Artistic Views." In T.J. Sergiovanni (ed), Supervision of Teaching. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Alexandria, VA.

Shannon, T. A.
1982 "Teacher Evaluation:Some Points to Ponder." The CEDR Quarterly 15:4(Winter):18.

Stark, J. S. and M. A. Lowther
1984 "Predictors of Teacher's Preferences Concerning Their Evaluation." Educational Administration Quartery 20:4(Fall):76-106.

Stiggins, R. J. and N. J. Bridgeford
1985 "Performance Assessment for Teacher Development." Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis 7:1(Spring): 85-97.

Stodolsky, Susan S.
1984 "Teacher Evaluation:The Limits of Looking." Educational Researcher (November):11-18.

Sweezey, William
1983 "Supervision- void without teachervision." The Canadian School Executive (June):12-13.

Townsend, David
1984 The First Year of Implementation of a Policy of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation in the Five Secondary Schools of Lethbridge School District No. 51. Planning Services, Alberta Education, Edmonton, June,1984.

University of Alberta
1985 Research Ethics Review Policies and Procedures. Department of Educational Administration. University of Alberta, July.

Webb, L. D.
1983 "Teacher Evaluation." Reprinted from Educators and the Law. S. B. Thomas(ed), N. H. Cambron-McCabe, and M. McCarthy. Elmont,NY: Institute for School Law and Finance. ERIC no. ED240661.

Wise, A., L. Darling-Hammond, M. McLaughlin, and H. Berstein
1985 "Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices." The Elementary School Journal 86:1(September):61-121.

Wise, A., L. Darling-Hammond, M. McLaughlin, and H. Berstein
1984 Case Studies for Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, June,1984.

Wood, C.J. and P.A. Pohland
1983 "Teacher Evaluation and the 'Hand of History'." The Journal of Educational Administration 21:2 (Summer):168-181.

APPENDIX 1

Provincial Evaluation Policies

Teacher Evaluation

POLICY

The performance of individual teachers and the quality of teaching practices across the province will be evaluated to assist in the provision of effective instruction to students and in the professional growth and development of teachers.

GUIDELINES

1. The primary responsibility for the evaluation of individual teacher performance and for the quality of teaching practice lies with each school board.
2. Each school board will develop, keep current, and implement written policies, guidelines, and procedures in keeping with the intent of Provincial policies, guidelines, and procedures. These policies, guidelines, and procedures will be a matter of public record, available upon request. Alberta Education will assist school boards in the development of policies, guidelines, and procedures.
3. Alberta Education will not hear any appeals from individual teachers who are dissatisfied with evaluation reports from school boards whose policies are consistent with the principles of natural justice and provide an appeal mechanism. Alberta Education may consider such appeals from teachers employed by school boards whose policies do not contain such provisions.
4. Alberta Education and school boards are responsible for ensuring that:
   (a) teacher evaluation policies and guidelines are implemented appropriately; and that
   (b) high standards of teaching practice are achieved and maintained across the province.
5. Teacher evaluation policies:
   (a) will be applicable to all teachers;
   (b) will be fair and consistent in application;
   (c) should permit consultation with teachers in the development of policy, guidelines, and procedures;
   (d) will ensure that the evaluation report is made available to the teacher in question after its completion; and
   (e) will be consistent with the principles of natural justice and provide an appeal mechanism.
6. The results of evaluations will be utilized to:
   (a) assist the professional development of teachers;
   (b) develop improved measures of teacher performance; and
   (c) take appropriate action with respect to teachers whose performance is unacceptable.
7. Alberta Education will conduct teacher evaluations in private schools and privately operated Early Childhood Services centres for the purpose of recommending permanent certification.
8. Alberta Education will investigate specific incidents involving professional staff in the employ of school boards when it is deemed by the Minister to be necessary and in the best public interest to do so.
9. A teacher who desires to appeal any matter relating to the suspension or cancellation of a certificate may appeal to the Council on Alberta Teaching Standards.

Program, school and school system evaluations are separate, but closely linked processes. The results of program and school evaluations can form part of the school system evaluation, or visa versa. Consequently, the three interrelated policies are outlined below and one set of guidelines are provided for all these policies.

APPENDIX 2

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the thesis submitted for microfilming.

Please refer to the National Library of Canada target (sheet 1, frame 2) entitled:

CANADIAN THESES

NOTICE

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage.

Veuillez consulter la cible de la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada (microfiche 1, image 2) intitulée:

THÈSES CANADIENNES

AVIS

Alberta
EDUCATION

Devonian Building, West Tower, 11160 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L2

TO: BOARD CHAIRPERSONS
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
PRIVATE SCHOOLS
PRIVATE E.C.S. OPERATORS

RE: EVALUATION POLICIES MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE PLAN

An important aspect of the Management and Finance Plan is that all school jurisdictions, private schools and privately operated Early Childhood Services Centres are required to develop and implement, within the framework of provincial policy, their own student, teacher, program, school and school system evaluation policies.

As of January 31, 1985, all Alberta school jurisdictions should have in place teacher evaluation and student evaluation policies, guidelines and procedures. As of June 30, 1985, policies, guidelines and procedures should also be in place for the evaluation of programs, schools and the school system.

Regional Offices of Education are responsible for providing assistance in the development of policies and for the implementation of these policies.

Enclosed, as information, is a set of guidelines which will be used by the Regional Offices for monitoring student, teacher, program and school evaluation policies. Guidelines for monitoring school system evaluation policies will follow the same format and will be ready in the near future.

These guidelines have been developed for the use, primarily, of our Regional Offices. Therefore, the guidelines should be considered as non-prescriptive with the exception of the mandatory inclusion of an appeal and due process procedure in the teacher evaluation policy. It should be further noted that although a due process and appeal procedure is mandated with respect to teacher evaluation policy, Alberta Education does not propose to specify its content.

Your continuing support in the implementation of the Management and Finance Plan in the interests of providing quality education for children in our province is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Reno A. Bosetti
Deputy Minister

c.c. Honourable David King

Enclosure

GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING
TEACHER EVALUATION
POLICIES, GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

A. Format

(1) The suggested format of background, policy, guidelines and procedures is used.

B. Background

(1) The background statement outlines the context and rationale for the accompanying policy, guidelines and procedures.

C. Policy Statement

(1) The statement tells what is desired and why.

(2) The statement provides positive direction to management and staff but does not prescribe methods.

(3) The statement permits managers and staff to meet changing conditions without rewriting the policy.

D. Guidelines

(1) The guidelines clarify the key elements of the policy statement.

(2) The guidelines indicate, generally, how major aspects of the policy will be administered.

(3) The guidelines differentiate between mandatory and discretionary provisions. That is, mandatory guidelines are denoted by shall or must, discretionary guidelines are denoted by should or may.

(4) The purposes and the priorities of the evaluations are identified. These may include some of the following:

- certification
- recognition of excellence
- staff deployment (placement, transfer, teacher assignments)

- tenure
- termination
- professional development (e.g.: inservice, consultation, conference)
- promotion
- improvement of instruction
- other

(5) Teachers covered under the policy are specified. For example, these may include:

- probationary status teachers (new to the system)
- tenured teachers
- substitute teachers
- temporary contract teachers
- other

E. Procedures

(1) The procedures delineate between mandatory and discretionary activities.

(2) The procedures for evaluating teaching performance are clear and appropriate relative to the following:

a) The sequence of activities required to carry out the evaluations is stated.

b) The various stages of teacher evaluation and the person (s) responsible are identified; some examples of stages are:

- evaluating teaching performance
- administering due process and appeal
- maintaining records
- reviewing and keeping current the policies, guidelines and procedures
- other

c) The reference to the means of data collection and the criteria for evaluating teaching performance is made.

d) Timelines for the evaluation process are specified and represent a regular review of teacher performance (e.g.: one per year, one every two years).

(3) There are provisions for keeping current and for systematically reviewing the policy, guidelines and procedures. For example:

a) Person(s) responsible for initiating the review are identified.

b) The basis (e.g.: frequency, conditions, etc.) for the initiation of a review is identified.

c) Others

(4) There is a delineated due process and appeal mechanism which outlines:

a) How appeals are initiated.

b) To whom the appeal is addressed.

c) How teachers and others are informed of the process.

d) Other

A due process and appeal mechanism is required by Alberta Education.

(5) Procedures for the maintenance of records of teacher evaluations are outlined. The procedures include:

a) Where the files are located.

b) Who is responsible for the files.

c) Who has access to the files.

d) A description of confidentiality parameters.

e) The teacher receiving a copy of the evaluation.

f) The teacher adding material to file.

(6) The procedures outline how the public can access the policies, guidelines and procedures.

F. Other

(1) Stakeholder involvement and the nature of involvement are outlined.

- teachers
- parents
- students
- administrators
- trustees
- others

(2) Other comments/factors to consider:

APPENDIX 3

ALBERTA TEACHER SUPERVISION SURVEY

1. What do you consider the hallmarks of an effective teacher supervision program? List the criteria below.

2. Nominate one school jurisdiction in Alberta (other then your own) which you feel is characterized by your above criteria.

3. How would you rate your school jurisdiction's teacher supervision program in comparison to the above criteria?

much more effective	more effective	equally effective	less effective	still developing
1	2	3	4	5

4. If you have any additional comments regarding this survey, please indicate them below. (If more space is required use the back of this sheet.)

5. Optional: If you would like to receive a copy of a summary of my research report, please record your return address below.

_____

_____

_____

Return to:

Gary Babiuk
M.Ed. Program
Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
T6G 2G5

APPENDIX 4

University of Alberta
Edmonton
Canada T6G 2G5

Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Education
7-104 Education Building North, Telephone (403) 432-5211

Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta

February 17,1986

Dear Superintendent,

The attached teacher supervision survey is the first phase of a province wide study designed to identify the characteristics of an effective teacher supervision program. The results of this survey will be used to choose one or more school jurisdictions for a later case study. They will also be used as a method of gaining an overall perspective on how superintendents in Alberta define an effective teacher supervision program.

I am particularly interested in obtaining your response because your experience as a superintendent gives you pertinent knowledge of this subject.

The results of the survey and the subsequent case study will be useful to all educators interested in developing or revising their present teacher supervision program. You will be given the opportunity to receive a summary of the results of this study for your own use.

The time required to complete this survey is approximately 15 minutes. It would be appreciated if you could take some time out from your busy schedule and complete the enclosed survey prior to March 3,1986.

Please return the survey in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. The next stage of my research, the case study, which is part of my M.Ed. program, can only be carried out once I have received your completed survey.

The findings of the survey will be reported anonymously, and the respondents' identities kept confidential.

Yours truly,

Gary Babiuk
MEd. Student

APPENDIX 5

University of Alberta
Edmonton
Canada T6G 2G5

Department of Educational Administration
Faculty of Education
7-104 Education Building North. Telephone (403) 432-5241

Department of Educational Administration
University of Alberta

March 14, 1986.

Dear Superintendent,

During the week of February 17, 1986 you should have received in the mail a short questionnaire, entitled Alberta Teacher Supervision Survey. The purpose of the survey is to refine the understanding concerning teacher supervision and evaluation in Alberta. Your professional knowledge and experience is a valuable source of expert information.

The findings of the research project will be made available to all interested administrators. Hopefully these findings will help them in the managing of their teacher supervision programs.

If you have already completed and returned the survey, I thank you for your cooperation. If not, please complete and return the survey as soon as possible, preferably by March 27, 1986. I have enclosed another copy of the survey for your convenience.

Please be assured that the findings of the survey will be reported anonymously and the respondents' identities kept confidential. Your response is very critical to this research.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

Yours truly,

Gary Babiuk
MEd. Student

APPENDIX 6

AN EFFECTIVE PROGRAM FOR TEACHER EVALUATION AND SUPERVISION

A CASE STUDY

A. Purpose : To provide a detailed or as the literature states a "rich" or "thick" description of an effective district program for teacher evaluation and supervision within the context of the local environment and culture.

B. *Tentative Outline of Itinerary*

During Office / School Hours

Monday- A.M. - visit central office
- interview superintendent and any other central office staff involved in teacher evaluation or supervision.(see attached list of sample interview questions)
- gather documents (see attached list of sample documents)
- plan for visits with principals

P.M. - continue with the above
- if time permits visit first principal/school

Tuesday
Wednesday
Thursday - one-half day at each of six schools selected randomly
- interview principal/teachers/others (see attached list of sample interview questions)
- gather documents (see attached list of sample documents)

Friday - open: to be used to complete study and fill-in missing interviews or information

After Hours

Monday to Thursday - attend meetings, community events, etc.

C. *Respondents to be Interviewed*

1. Superintendent
2. Central Office Staff (involved in teacher evaluation and supervision)
3. Principals (approx. six from all three levels)
4. Other school administrators (vice principals/dept. heads)
5. Teachers (approx. six from each school visited)
6. ATA representative
7. Parents (if possible, at parents meeting or community school)
8. Trustee (if possible after a board meeting)

D. *Methodology*

1. Interviews - information will be gather under the following four main topics related to the district teacher evaluation / supervision program (historical,developmental,current,future)
   - a list of sample questions is attached
   - most interviews will be approx. 20-30 minutes

2. Documentation - a list of sample documents is attached

3. Observations - a list of observations is attached

4. Personal Journal - daily entries will be made

F. *Ethical Considerations*

All participants will be fully informed of the purpose of the study and voluntary consent will be solicited from each participant. They will also be given the option to withdraw from the study at any point. All information gained from interviews will be treated confidentially. Participants will be guaranteed anonymity in the reporting of the results through the use of descriptive accounts of the data rather than verbatim examples. Results will be reported as a composite group, not as individuals. In addition, key participants will be asked to review portions of the report to ensure accuracy before publication.

G. *Reporting Results / Follow-up*

A copy of a summary of the research report will be made available to all respondents and a copy of the final thesis will be presented to the superintendent for the school districts.

SAMPLE LIST OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS / DOCUMENTATION / OBSERVATIONS

Interview Questions

1. *Antecedent / Historical*
   a. What was your previous experience with teacher evaluation?
   b. How long have you been with this school district?
   c. What was teacher evaluation like in this school district before the present system was implemented?
   d. Why do you think the present teacher evaluation program was implemented?
2. *Developmental*
   a. What was your role in the development of the current teacher evaluation program?
   b. Describe the process used to develop and implement the current teacher evaluation program?
   c. What do you think were the underlying goals/purposes/concepts/models of the program?
   d. Were there any problems in the development of the program? If so, what were they? How were they overcome? Are they still problems?
   e. Was any in-service or training provided during this developmental period?
3. *Present Situation / Current Effectiveness*
   a. What is your overall impression of the teacher evaluation program?
   b. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the present program?
   c. Are there evaluation programs in place for other aspects of the school district operation?
   d. How does the teacher evaluation program fit into the overall program of education of the school district?
   e. What is your role in the teacher evaluation program?
   f. What do you feel are the goals of education?
   g. How would you describe effective teaching?
4. *The future*
   a. Do you see a need for change in the future?
   b. What will be your role in any future change?

DOCUMENTS

1. District Evaluation Policies
2. Evaluation Instruments
3. Other district policies that relate to teacher evaluation (ie. inservice, evaluation of first and second year teachers)
4. outline of related evaluations (program, student, school, district), transfer policies, review of service, peer advisors administrator evaluation
5. policy handbook for district and possibly individual schools
6. records of the number of students, schools, teachers, etc.
7. statements of goals and purposes of education in general and programs in particular
8. Community information (from city hall)

Observations

1. Attend a board meeting
2. Attend a staff meeting
3. Attend a parent meeting
4. General observations of each school and the community during my week visit.

APPENDIX 7

INTERVIEW GUIDE

FORMAT

1. Introduction of researcher to interviewee.
2. Outline purpose of the study.
3. Assure Confidentiality.
4. Assure Anonymity.
5. Ask questions outlined in guide.
6. Closure and Thank You.

QUESTIONS

A. Superintendent / Central Office Administrators.

Antecedent / Historical

1. What is your previous experience as a teacher and administrator?
2. How long have you been with the board?
3. What was your previous involvement with teacher evaluation?
4. What was teacher evaluation like before the current policy was implemented?
5. What was the rationale for the changes in the teacher evaluation policies?

Developmental

1. What was your role in the development of the current teacher evaluation program?
2. Describe the process used to develop and implement the program.
3. What are the underlying goals/purposes/concepts models of the present teacher evaluation program?
4. Were there any problems or difficulties in the development of the program? If so, what were they and how were they overcome?
5. Was any in-service or training provided to help develop and implement the program?

Present Situation

1. What is your role in the operation of the teacher evaluation program?

2. How does teacher evaluation fit into the overall education program of this district?
3. What do you see as the strengths of this program?
4. What do you see as the weaknesses of this program?
5. What is your overall impression of the program?
6. Describe the administrators evaluation program.
7. Describe what you feel is effective teaching.
8. What are the goals of education in this district?

Conclusion

1. Describe any changes you feel may be needed in the future.
2. Is there anything else you would like to say about teacher evaluation that I may have forgot to ask you or you now remember?

B. Principals and Vice Principals.

Antecedent / Historical

1. What is your previous experience as a teacher and administrator?
2. What is your experience in this school district?
3. What is your previous involvement in teacher evaluation?
4. Why do you think the current teacher evaluation program was implemented? What lead to the change?

Developmental

1. What was your role in the development of the current teacher evaluation program?
2. Describe the process of the development and implementation of the program.
3. What were the underlying goals/purposes/concepts/models of the current program?
4. Were there any problems during the development stage? If so what were they and how were they handled?
5. Describe any training or in-service that you received during the development and implementation.

Present Situation

1. What is your role in the current teacher evaluation program?
2. Describe how you evaluate teachers and the instrument that you use.
3. How many teachers do you evaluate in a year and how many observation will be made of each teacher?
4. Describe what you look for in evaluating a teacher.

5. What are the strengths of the current teacher evaluation program?
6. What are the limitations?
7. Describe your administrators evaluation.
8. How does teacher evaluation fit into the overall education program in this district?
9. What are the goals of education in this district?

Conclusion

1. Do you see the need for any changes to the teacher evaluation program in the future?
2. Is there anything else you would like to say about teacher evaluation that I may have forgot to ask you or you now remember?

C. Teachers.

Antecedent / Historical

1. What is your background in teaching?
2. What is your past experience with teacher evaluation?
3. How long have you been with the board?
4. What was teacher evaluation like before the current program was implemented?
5. Why do you think the current program was implemented? What lead to the change?

Developmental

1. What was your role in the development and implementation of the teacher evaluation program?
2. Describe the process of the development and implementation.
3. What were the underlying goals/purposes/concepts/ models of the current teacher evaluation program?
4. Describe any problems that were encountered during the development and implementation.
5. Did you receive any training or in-service during the development or implementation of the program?

Present Situation

1. Describe how you were last evaluated. How many times were you observed? When was the last time?
2. Describe how the teacher evaluation program effects you?
3. What do you think is the purpose of the teacher evaluation program?
4. Describe the final report and how it was presented to you.

5. What happens to a teacher who is considered weak?
6. What do you see as the strengths of the program?
7. What are the weaknesses?
8. What do you think the evaluator is looking for as characteristics of effective teaching?
9. What are the goals of education in this district?

Conclusion

1. Describe any future changes you see necessary to the teacher evaluation program.
2. Is there anything else you would like to say about teacher evaluation that I may have forgot to ask you or you now remember?

APPENDIX 8

June 14, 1987

Dear ,

I am now in the final stages of completing my thesis. During the time since I last saw in May, 1986, when I interviewed you about your perceptions of the Red Deer Teacher Evaluation Program, I have summarized the transcripts of the interviews into the attached section of my thesis. One way of verifying the accuracy of my summarization is to request a random sample, of those educators that I interviewed, to review and make comments about the summary.

Thus, I would appreciate it if you would read the attached document. The major purpose of your review is to make comments on the accuracy of my description of the Red Deer Teacher Evaluation Program, a kind of perception check. However, any comments or criticisms you may have are most welcome. Please feel free to write and make comments on the attached draft.

As a mail strike may cause some inconvenience, I have made arrangements for you to drop-off you comments at the Red Deer Central Office. I would ask that you, after reading and making your comments, place the draft in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope and if a mail strike is in progress return the envelop to your central office, where I will pick it up. If, on the other hand, there is no strike, just drop it in the mail.

I plan to complete my thesis during July while working with my advisor at the University of Alberta. I hope to send everyone, who was involved in my research project, a summary of the results of my thesis in the fall.

I hope you have a relaxing and enjoyable summer. Thank you again for your assistance and cooperation.

Yours truly,

Gary Babiuk
MEd Student
University of Alberta

Encl.

APPENDIX 9

The following are some of the statements made by superintendents on the importance of *knowledge and understanding* in developing an efficient teacher evaluation program:

"That all teachers understand the supervision process as detailed in district policy."

"Published criteria of effective teaching."

"Includes criteria to be used to evaluate."

"Policies, guidelines and procedures are communicated to all teachers."

"Purposes for the evaluation are clearly stated."

"Teachers need to know the 'rules of the game'."

"Teachers and evaluators must have good knowledge of guidelines and procedures to be used."

"Full teacher knowledge of process, time-lines, criteria."

"Criteria for effective teaching outlined and approved by the board."

"The system has established expectations and that these are communicated to participants."

"That the purposes of supervision / evaluation be clearly delineated in district policy."

"A clear statement of policy (what the board believes)."

"That all teachers know who is responsible for supervising, and for writing reports."

APPENDIX 10

The following are some of the comments made by superintendents on the need for *feedback and follow-up* in developing an effective teacher evaluation program:

"Follow-up and feedback for the teacher."

"Opportunities are given to those being evaluated to express their opinion about their evaluation."

"Provides for adequate schedule of follow-up activities and for adequate time, circumstances for adjustment, corrective and remedial procedures to occur."

"Data collected should be discussed with the teacher and should be the basis for suggested improvements/ refinements."

"Provide for collegial, professional interaction among staff."

"That pre and post conferences be held, one that provides follow-up and coaching."

"Should follow-up observations to determine whether suggestions have been effectively implemented."

"Opportunities for communication and exchange between the evaluator and teacher."

"Draft report with teacher input."

"Includes alternatives when performance is unsatisfactory."

"Post conferences after the visit and when report is delivered to teacher."

"The teacher has every chance to discuss the evaluation with the supervisor."

APPENDIX 11

The following are some of the statements made by superintendents on the need for support by the board in developing an effective teacher evaluation program:

"Planned activities to improve teacher performance ie. in-service and development."

"Providing teachers with assistance for the total planning, for delivering of and evaluation of the education program."

"All participants receive in-service on supervision procedures and techniques."

"One that incorporates an effective teaching program on a volunteer basis and one which also includes a program to train supervisors of instruction, in-school and system administrators to conduct both formative and summative evaluation."

"The system has a coordinated plan for in-service and training of participants (eg. administrators, coordinators, teacher)Participants should take responsibility for the program."

"In-service needs to be a priority for evaluators in order that they understand the 'effective' teacher characteristics to ensure reliability in evaluations."

"Trained personnel to accomplish positive change."

"Highly skilled supervisors, knowledgeable in pedagogy, supervision and conferencing."

"Professional development in techniques to be used, develop skills for those involved in evaluation."

APPENDIX 12

The following are some of the statements made by superintendents on the need for *cooperation and teacher input* in developing an effective teacher evaluation program:

"Approached with a cooperative attitude by all parties."

"Jointly established."

"Persons being evaluated and those doing the evaluation were involved in the development of the system."

"Teachers and evaluators must mutually agree on goals and objectives which are to be accomplished, based on information gained in the supervising program."

"Development and implementation of policy involves teachers and school administrators."

"Input from teachers is essential when developing policy."

"Teachers to be actively involved in setting guidelines."

"Permit consultation with teachers in the development of policy guidelines and procedures."

"Joint development of the program."

"It uses the collegial mode."

"Teachers and administrators develop growth objectives."

"Teacher involvement in setting evaluation criteria."

"Teacher initiated as much as possible."

"Teacher acceptance of the concept."

APPENDIX 13

The following are some of the statements made by superintendents on the need for an effective teacher evaluation program to be *based on research* or some agreed on model of teaching:

"Criteria based upon characteristics which are necessary for effective instruction and learning."

"One which relates to current research and literature eg. effective schools, Madeline Hunter, Goodlaw, Dr. Mireau."

"The 'effective' characteristics need to be identified and based on current research if it is to be valid."

"Evaluation or supervision must be based on evaluating what we currently know makes a difference in instructional activities."

"Evaluation criteria are directly related to the responsibilities of the person being evaluated, such criteria to include observable job behaviors and be flexible enough to take individual difference into account."

"Observations to be based upon salient, visible features that can be recorded from pupil and teacher behavior in the classroom."

"Is there evidence of improvement in teachers' skills (empirical / verifiable)."

"Developed as a result of effective teaching and effective school research. ie. objective data is essential to analyze performance."

APPENDIX 14

The following are some of the statements made by superintendents that seem to indicate that they feel trust is an essential part of a successful teacher evaluation program:

"Is it fair/equitable?"

"Based on mutual trust, respect and responsibility."

"Establish a sense of trust."

"Adherence to the rules of 'natural justice."

"Teacher must be given time to improve."

"Due process with written description of areas for change."

"Mechanism needed for teacher to be given opportunity to remediate weakness(es) should they exist."

"That all teachers have the right of appeal with respect to any report."

"That teacher receives a copy of report and that a response appeal procedure be available."

"Systematic the evaluation process should be applied to all teachers using appropriate but relatively stable criteria of evaluation."

"Fair and consistent in application."

"Consistent with the principles of natural justice."

"An underlying philosophy which regards the worth and dignity of the individual as paramount."

"Respect for the teacher as a person."

"Predicated on a positive, supportive rather than a negative 'watchdog' thrust."

"It aids the teacher in identifying and capitalizing on strengths."

"Basic assumptions for evaluating is that it must be an honest, positive approach to improving the learning climate."

APPENDIX 15

NOMINATION TOTALS

The following list is the school jurisdictions that received at least one nomination in question 2 of the questionnaire sent to superintendents.

School Jurisdiction	Number
Red Deer School District #104	11
Edmonton School District #7	5
Edmonton R.C.S.S.District #7	5
Rocky View School Division #41	3
Calgary R.C.S.S.District #1	2
County of Ponoka #3	2
Fort McMurray R.C.S.S.District #32	2
Lethbridge School District #51	2
County of Barrhead #11	1
County of Forty Mile #8	1
County of Lacombe #14	1
County of Mountainview #17	1
County of Parkland #31	1
County of Red Deer #23	1
County of St. Paul #19	1
County of Stettler #6	1
County of Vulcan #2	1
County of Wetaskwin #10	1
Leduc School District #297	1
Pincher Creek R.C.S.S.District #18	1
St. Albert P.S.S.District #6	1
Sturgeon School Division #24	1
Theresetta R.C.S.S.D. #23/Neutral Hills S.D.#16/ County of Paintearth #18	1

APPENDIX 16

Policy 1000

GOAL OF THE RED DEER PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 104

In keeping with the Goals of Basic Education for Alberta, the principal goal of the Red Deer Public School District is to enable each student to develop to the fullest extent such talents and abilities as he may possess so that he may become an active and competent citizen in his contemporary society. The Board of Trustees recognizes that many agencies in the community influence the achievement of this goal and that the school has a special but not exclusive function in the areas of developing basic skills, in presenting certain organized bodies of knowledge about the physical and social environment, in developing intellectual abilities, and in assisting the student to evolve a value system which recognizes his individual worth and his responsibility to society. In fulfilling its responsibilities toward the achievement of the goal, the Board of Trustees recognizes that the school programs are the means and teachers are the most important agents by which the goal may be achieved.

The primary purpose of administration and special services is to establish those conditions under which a teacher can do his best for the student.

In setting this goal and this purpose the Board of Trustees recognizes:

1. the need for the school to work in harmony with expectations of the student, his parents, the community, and society,

2. the need to seek evidence to evaluate existing programs, changes in curricula, teacher effectiveness, special services, and administrative organization, and,

3. the need to operate within the financial resources of the district.

Approved by the Board
January 6th, 1982

Policy 3005

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

The Board of Trustees of the Red Deer Public School District No. 104 shall appoint a person to the position of Superintendent of Schools.

The Superintendent of Schools shall be the chief executive officer of the Red Deer Public School District and is responsible for the total operation of the school system in a manner which is consistent with the School Act, Alberta Education procedures, Red Deer Public School District policies, regulations and procedures, and is accountable for the foregoing to the trustees of the Red Deer Public School District.

The duties include leadership in educational matters for the effective and efficient delivery of educational programs and services; implementation of Board policies and decisions; and development of appropriate regulations and procedures to accomplish this; notification to trustees when Board motions or Red Deer Public School District action is in contradiction to approved policy; delegation of responsibility and maintenance of communication channels within the administrative structure; advice to trustees on matters of concern or interest; provision to trustees of recommendations and/or opinions and disclosure to trustees of such contrary opinions as may be known to the Superintendent of Schools from other levels of the organization; liaison with other public and private agencies for the mutual benefit of the system and the community, and for adequate representation of education concerns to the public; evaluation of the staff and the system.

In situations where emergent action is imperative, and when neither the Chairman nor the Vice-Chairman is available for consultation, the Superintendent shall act on behalf of the Board. However, if such emergent action is taken, the Superintendent must notify the Chairman and/or the Vice-Chairman at the earliest opportunity, advise trustees in writing of the action, and file a report at the first scheduled meeting of the Red Deer Public School District.

Approve October 27th, 1982

Policy 3007

SCHOOL REVIEWS AND EVALUATION

Schools will be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis for the purpose of improving and enhancing the quality of education offered to the students.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

SCHOOL REVIEWS AND EVALUATION

A. Aims

1. To enhance student growth and learning.
2. To provide professional assistance to staff members.
3. To facilitate the professional growth and development of staff members.
4. To ensure that all programs are being offered in accordance with Alberta Education requirements.
5. To provide parents the opportunity to indicate their preferences and suggestions with regard to the operation of the school.
6. To provide instructional and program recommendations for the school staff.

B. Components to be Reviewed

A school is a complex institution. Components listed are not in rank order. They are significant factors in ensuring that the school is performing effectively. Components include:

1. Emphasis on student learning and effective teaching.
2. Use of praise and rewards by all staff members.
3. Level of student expectations and achievement.
4. Appearance and comfort level of the school.
5. Organization and schedule for the programs for instruction.
6. Performance of each teacher.
7. Appropriateness of the role-models provided by staff members.
8. Meaningful involvement and communication with parents.
9. Use and development of appropriate resources.

10. Leadership provided by the principal and the administrative team.

11. Involvement of the teachers in the operation of the school.

12. Orderly and pleasant learning environment.

13. Consistency within the school.

C. Operational Guidelines and Procedures

1. Each school shall be reviewed and evaluated once every four years.

2. The review shall include:

   (a) evaluation of the principal's performance

   (b) observation of all programs

   (c) evaluation of each teacher's performance

   (d) a climate survey

   (e) a parental survey

   (f) recommendations for the school staff

3. All the reports and recommendations shall be prepared by the superintendent. Any individual reports shall be prepared at the request of the superintendent.

4. The superintendent shall be responsible for identifying and preparing the team members who will make up the review team for each school.

5. All reports shall be reviewed with the appropriate staff members. A summary report shall be reviewed with the Board of Trustees at a committee meeting.

6. The principals shall be responsible for considering the recommendations. The principal is expected to file a report within six months, outlining the action taken with regard to each recommendation.

7. Parents shall receive a copy of the parent survey results. They may also be invited to a parent meeting to review the results if it is appropriate.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

Policy 3008

SYSTEM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

The district will regularly review and evaluate the operation of this school system for the purpose of improving and enhancing the quality of education.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

SYSTEM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

A. Aims

1. To enhance student growth and learning.

2. To ensure that all programs are being offered in accordance with Alberta Education requirements.

3. To ensure that the goals of the district are being pursued and achieved.

4. To ensure that the policies and regulations of the district are being implemented.

B. Components to be Reviewed

A school is a complex institution. Components listed are not in rank order. They are significant factors in ensuring that the school is performing effectively. Components include:

1. Emphasis on student learning, effective teaching and effective leadership.

2. Effectiveness and appropriateness of district policies and regulations.

3. Leadership offered by the superintendent and other central office administrators.

4. Provision for meaningful involvement and communication with all staff members.

5. Provision for meaningful involvement and communication with parents and the community.

6. Efficient and effective use of resources.

7. Legal requirements outlined in the School Act and other provincial documents.

C. Operational Guidelines and Procedures

1. Each year a planning report shall be prepared by the superintendent. In preparing the planning report the superintendent will consider the suggestions of trustees, all staff members, parents and students. The planning report shall be reviewed at a Board meeting in September each school year.

2. District policies and regulations shall be reviewed annually. Proposed amendments and new policies shall be prepared in accordance with Board policy and the Alberta School Act.

3. Staff development and inservice programs shall be offered each year to ensure that the programs and district priorities are appropriately implemented.

4. The performance of the Superintendent of Schools shall be evaluated annually in accordance with the agreement between the Board and the superintendent.

5. The superintendent shall be responsible for evaluating the performance of the deputy superintendent and the assistant superintendents. The deputy superintendent shall evaluate the performance of the co-ordinators.

6. The co-ordinators will assist in assessing programs on a regular basis to ensure that all programs are implemented in accordance with Alberta Education requirements. The deputy superintendent shall be responsible for the overall evaluation of programs.

7. Parent and student concerns, perceptions and suggestions, shall be solicited and considered on a regular basis.

8. The Board of Trustees shall regularly review their performance as a Board to ensure that they are being responsive to their numerous publics, and to ensure that they are complying with the requirements of the Alberta School Act and other provincial documents.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

Policy 3009

ROLE OF THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT - PERSONNEL & ADMINISTRATION

The enhancement of teaching and learning is the foremost function of the assistant superintendent. In fulfilling this responsibility the assistant superintendent will:

- assist the Superintendent of Schools
- administer the teacher staffing program
- administer the collective agreement with A.T.A. Local #60
- administer and supervise personnel policies and procedures
- supervise and evaluate staff members

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

Regulation 3009

ROLE OF THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT - PERSONNEL & ADMINISTRATION

The Assistant Superintendent shall be responsible to the Superintendent of Schools. The duties and responsibilities for the position shall include personnel functions as well as administrative functions. The duties and responsibilities include:

1. Assisting the Superintendent in all matters related to the operation of the district.

2. Participating in district committees related to policy and regulation development, district management, and personnel functions.

3. Administering and developing the teacher staffing program for the district. The program will include identifying potential candidates, interviewing and screening candidates, reviewing position descriptions with principals, selecting candidates, assigning teachers to schools and transferring teachers.

4. Administering the staffing allocations and maintaining current records in accordance with budget approvals and district policy.

5. Administering the collective agreement with A.T.A. #60 to ensure that the terms of the collective agreement are met.

6. Supervising and administering the professional leave programs and the substitute teacher services.

7. Administering professional development leaves under Clause 14 of the collective agreement.

8. Administering and preparing the statistical information relative to staffing, enrolments and enrolment projections.

9. Administering and supervising the records and procedures relative to school opening and closing.

10. Assisting with the supervision and evaluation of teachers, administrators and schools.

11. Ensuring that all Alberta Education requirements relative to teacher certification are being met.

12. Maintaining a liaison with all appropriate organizations such as the Universities, D.N.D., Teacher Exchange Organizations and Alberta Education.

13. Preparing the teacher handbook.

14. Assuming other additional responsibilities as assigned by the Superintendent of Schools.

Policy 3010

ROLE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT

The enhancement of teaching and learning is the foremost ~~function of~~ the deputy superintendent. In fulfilling this responsibility the deputy superintendent will:

- assist the Superintendent of Schools
- supervise curriculum implementation and development
- supervise and evaluate instructional programs
- co-ordinate inservice and staff development programs
- supervise and evaluate staff members

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

Regulation 3010

ROLE OF THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT

The Deputy Superintendent shall be responsible to the Superintendent of Schools. The duties and responsibilities of the position shall include curriculum and program functions as well as administrative functions. The duties and responsibilities include:

1. Assisting the Superintendent in all matters related to the operation of the district.
2. Assuming the duties of Acting Superintendent in the absence of the Superintendent of Schools.
3. Participating in district committees related to policy and regulation development, district management, and program development.
4. Supervising and evaluating all instruction programs.
5. Developing instructional programs to ensure that appropriate programs are being offered.
6. Ensuring that all programs within the district are implemented in accordance with Alberta Education program.
7. Maintaining liaison with Alberta Education relative to curriculum changes, programs and policies.
8. Co-ordinating and supervising the E.O.F. program.
9. Maintaining liaison and representing administration on the management committees for all designated community schools.
10. Supervising and evaluating the Co-ordinators of Instruction.
11. Co-ordinating and administering the inservice programs.
12. Assisting with the supervision and evaluation of teachers, administrators and schools.
13. Assist with the computer programs relative to providing student data and administrative support for the schools.
14. Assuming other additional responsibilities as assigned by the Superintendent of Schools.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

Policy 7010

THE ROLE OF A CO-ORDINATOR

The primary role of a co-ordinator shall be to provide program leadership for the purpose of enhancing teaching and student learning.

Approved by the Board
March 14th, 1984

Regulation 7010

THE ROLE OF A CO-ORDINATOR

Proposed

1. To provide leadership, co-ordination, supervision and articulation in assigned program areas.

2. To assist and advise staff relative to:

   a. interpreting provincial curriculum guides and materials
   b. selecting and evaluating textbooks, resources, equipment and supplies
   c. developing effective instructional methods and strategies
   d. planning and implementing programs
   e. preparing budgets
   f. monitoring student progress and developing district exams

3. To assist in supervising and evaluating staff members.

4. To visit all schools to monitor program implementation in accordance with provincial and district requirements.

5. To communicate all pertinent information to appropriate staff and public.

6. To participate in district committees relative to policy and regulation development, program planning, and general district management.

7. To maintain on-going contact with appropriate provincial, national and international associations.

8. To maintain a current and viable knowledge base through continuous professional development and reading.

9. To provide in-service programs as appropriate for staff members.

10. To participate in planning new facilities, designing instructional areas and purchasing equipment.

11. To assist and assume such other duties assigned by the superintendent.

Approved March 14th, 1984

Policy 7020

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

The enhancement of teaching and learning is the foremost function of the principal. In fulfilling this responsibility the principal will:

- co-operate with the Superintendent of Schools
- manage the operation of the school
- supervise the school staff
- create the optimum learning environment
- develop an appropriate program
- establish effective staff development programs
- incorporate community resources in the learning process

Approved by the Board
April 13th, 1983

Regulation 7020

1st page of 3 pages

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

1. Co-operate with the Superintendent of Schools and serve as the Superintendent's representative in the school. In this regard the principal will:

   (a) interpret Board policy to the staff, the students and the community.

   (b) complete reports relative to the operation of the school.

   (c) make the Superintendent aware of conditions which adversely affect the operation of the school or the maintenance of a highly effective instructional program.

   (d) become knowledgeable about regulations directives, notices, bulletins, etc./ and make them available to the staff.

   (e) become knowledgeable about the organization, the services and the programs offered in the district.

2. Efficient management of the operation of the school requires that the principal will:

   (a) interpret and accept responsibility for such areas as student attendance, plant operation, safety and personnel supervision.

   (b) assist in the recruitment, selection, placement and evaluation of school personnel.

   (c) communicate and work with central administration, supervisory personnel and other principals for the purpose of sharing ideas, problems, expertise, resources and personnel.

   (d) delegate appropriate responsibilities and tasks to members of the staff.

   (e) effectively cope with emergencies.

   (f) assist in inspecting the facilities as well as carrying out procedures to improve, modify and/or repair the school plant.

   (g) manage the school finances in a responsible and efficient manner.

   (h) design and develop an appropriate administrative team.

   (i) hold staff meetings on a regular basis.

3. In order to create the optimum school learning environment for students the principal will:

   (a) establish and sustain the goals and policies for the school.

   (b) develop strategies for implementing the goals and policies.

   (c) involve appropriate members of the school community in the operation of the school.

   (d) assist staff members by involving specialist staff, counsellors, administrators, support staff, parents and other community personnel.

   (e) assist in an assessment program to measure the school's effectiveness.

   (f) develop and implement a leadership role which includes team and partnership approaches.

   (g) establish an appropriate and acceptable level of conduct, behavior and discipline.

   (h) communicate effectively with students in groups and individually.

4. In the development of an appropriate program the principal, with the staff, will:

   (a) assess the unique needs of learners.

   (b) use research and information in formulating teaching and change strategies.

   (c) assign staff to particular instructional areas.

   (d) acquire and assign materials, equipment, resources and facilities.

   (e) communicate instructional and curriculum changes to parents and the community.

   (f) assist in evaluating both curricular and co-curricular programs.

   (g) develop appropriate student-staff groupings.

   (h) assess and record the achievement of students.

   (i) implement programs in accordance with provincial regulations.

5. Meeting the learning needs of the staff should be accommodated by an ongoing staff development program. The principal will:

   (a) foster the concept that staff members are also continuous learners.

   (b) encourage staff members to participate in workshops, inservice activities, seminars, conferences, university courses, classroom intervisitations and self-evaluation programs.

   (c) develop strategies to include staff members: in planning and development activities, preparing materials, using resources and assessing achievement.

   (d) maintain a professional library for the staff.

   (e) provide for orientation of new staff members.

   (f) provide consultative and supervisory assistance within the school.

   (g) effectively utilize other district personnel.

6. In order to incorporate the community's resources in the learning environment, the principal will:

   (a) assess the climate in the school-community setting.

   (b) promote community awareness and support for the school's program, achievements and goals.

   (c) communicate effectively with parents and the community by such means as conferences, meetings, newsletters, and news media.

   (d) work with the staff to develop community resources and use them in the learning process.

   (e) promote the community use of appropriate school resources, programs and facilities.

Approved April 13th, 1983

Policy 7041

SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

The primary purpose for the supervision and evaluation of teachers is to enhance and maintain a high standard of instruction.

Approved April 13th, 1983

Regulation 7041
1st page of 3 pages

SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

1. Aims
   (a) To enhance student growth and learning.
   (b) To recognize the worth and value of each teacher.
   (c) To provide professional assistance.
   (d) To ensure appropriate teaching assignments.
   (e) To facilitate professional growth and development.

2. Operational Requirements
   The teacher must have the opportunity:
   (a) to be evaluated in an atmosphere of trust and confidence.
   (b) to review and discuss all written reports.
   (c) to respond to all reports in writing.
   (d) to seek professional assistance and consultation.
   (e) to review the evaluation criteria.
   (f) to appeal the evaluation to the Superintendent of Schools.

3. Performance Criteria

   It is realized that the philosophical background, the methodological expertise, the learning theory knowledge, the classroom context, and the personality of the teacher are extremely important. The criteria listed are intended to provide a guideline only.

   The criteria are not in rank order, and each criterion has several components which relate to effective teaching.

Criteria	Criteria Component
Positive Interpersonal Relations with Students	- demonstrates respect for students - tolerant of student ideas - available to students - helpful to students - treats students fairly and objectively - communicates effectively with students - sensitive to student feelings - provides opportunities for success - inspires students to learn and to seek knowledge
Classroom Management	- defines learning objectives and teaches toward them - establishes reasonable, but challenging expectations for students - demonstrates business-like or task-oriented behavior - uses class time efficiently

Criteria	Criteria Component
Classroom Management (continued)	- makes students aware of their responsibilities - establishes a difficulty level of instruction which is appropriate monitors student progress and adjusts the pace appropriately - uses discipline techniques effectively - stimulates students by exhibiting enthusiasm, the enjoyment of humor, and vibrancy - encourages regular attendance and punctuality - sustains student attention and involvement
Curriculum Knowledge	- knowledgeable about the program of studies - comprehensive understanding of the appropriate curriculum content - translates the curriculum into learning activities for students - maintains knowledge base by participation in staff development activities
Instructional Strategies	- knowledgeable about student growth and development - knowledgeable about, and able to effectively use learning theory - selects and appropriately uses learning materials (hardware and software) - designs and executes lesson plans, long-term instructional plans - develops and uses appropriate evaluation techniques - responds to unique situations appropriately - explains things to students effectively - structures comments and uses effective questioning techniques
Out-of-Class Behavior	- strives to be an effective team member - reports student progress to parents effectively - utilizes community resources in instruction - assumes additional responsibilities outside the classroom - strives for improvement through professional development activities

4. Evaluation Process

For the purpose of reporting, it is recommended that formal and informal procedures be adopted. "Informal" refers to those procedures where the administrator assesses the performance of a teacher, provides feedback, but does not prepare a formal written report. This should be a continuous process and can lead to formal procedures. "Formal" refers to the procedure when the evaluation report is prepared and a copy forwarded to the Superintendent of Schools.

5. Documentation Procedures

When formal procedures are followed, the following must occur:

1. A report completed by the administrator must be addressed to the teacher and discussed with the teacher.

2. A copy of the report must be given to the teacher and a copy sent to the superintendent.

3. The teacher's personal file is available to be reviewed upon request.

6. Personnel Involved

The personnel involved in the formal reporting procedure may include the principal, the co-ordinators, the assistant superintendents and the superintendent.

Approved April 13th, 1983

Policy 8024

PROGRAM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Programs will be regularly reviewed and evaluated for the purpose of ensuring that program goals and objectives are being pursued and achieved.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984

Regulation 6014
1st page of 2 pages

PROGRAM REVIEW AND EVALUATION

A. Aims

1. To enhance student growth and learning.

2. To ensure that all programs are being offered in accordance with local and Alberta Education requirements.

3. To ensure that efficient and suitable program strategies are being adopted.

4. To ensure that suitable resources are being provided and appropriately used.

5. To provide appropriate inservice and professional development programs for teachers and administrators.

B. Components to be Reviewed

The program components are not in rank order. They are considered to be significant with regard to an effective program. The components include:

1. Emphasis on student learning and effective teaching.

2. Effectiveness and appropriateness of Board policies and regulations.

3. Leadership offered by the district and school administrators.

4. Adequacy of all program resources.

5. Legal requirements of all provincial documents such as curriculum guides and handbook regulations.

C. Operational Guidelines and Procedures

1. Each year the planning report shall identify specific programs which shall be reviewed and evaluated.

2. The Co-ordinators, in accordance with policy, shall provide leadership, co-ordination, supervision and articulation in assigned program areas.

3. Resources shall be reviewed and evaluated on a regular basis to ensure that they are appropriate.

4. Inservice and staff development programs shall be offered on a regular basis to ensure program goals and objectives are appropriately pursued and achieved.

5. Program evaluation reports shall be reviewed and presented to the Board with recommendations at a public Board meeting.

6. Alberta Education shall be notified about concerns and problems as well as successful solutions to provincial programs.

7. Program budgets shall be reviewed on an annual basis to evaluate appropriate budget support is identified and presented to the Board.

8. Parent and student concerns, perceptions and suggestions about programs shall be solicited and considered on a regular basis.

Approved by the Board
November 14th, 1984